


JESUIT-KRAUSS-MCCORMICK LIBRARY




3 9967 00036 7941



Ex Libris

DR. NILS FORSANDER
LIBRARY

N. Forsander.
Rock Island. Ill.
No 445. 1893.
~~No 447.~~



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

EDINBURGH, *December* 1871.

MESSRS. CLARK have pleasure in publishing, as the Second Issue of FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY for 1871 :

DELITZSCH'S COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS, Vol. III. (completion), and

HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT, Vol. I. (to be completed in another volume), by the late Professor HENGSTENBERG of Berlin.

The latter is a posthumous work ; and the Publishers rejoice to add this last trophy to the well-earned fame of one who did so much for the defence of the truth.

They beg respectfully to invite attention to the Series of 'LANGE' COMMENTARIES, edited by Dr. SCHAFF.

They have just published the COMMENTARY ON ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, with Notes and Additions by Dr. SCHAFF, which may be had by Subscribers to FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, in one large imperial 8vo volume, for 15s.

They have also felt themselves called upon to publish the Translation of Dr. LANGE'S COMMENTARY ON ST. JOHN, *uniform with the* FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, but without Dr. SCHAFF'S Notes and Additions ; and this may be had in two volumes, demy 8vo, for 10s. 6d., by Subscribers to this Series *only* ; and in ordering, they particularly request that the edition desired may be distinctly specified. This Edition will be ready shortly.

The First Issue for 1872 will probably be KEIL on DANIEL and on KINGS.

An early remittance of Subscription will much oblige.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
HAS THE PLEASURE TO ANNOUNCE THAT THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN
MEDICAL ASSOCIATION HAS BEEN REORGANIZED AND IS NOW PUBLISHED
AS THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE
JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF JANUARY, 1917.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF FEBRUARY, 1917.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF MARCH, 1917.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF APRIL, 1917.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF MAY, 1917.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF JUNE, 1917.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF JULY, 1917.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF AUGUST, 1917.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF SEPTEMBER, 1917.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF OCTOBER, 1917.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF NOVEMBER, 1917.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF DECEMBER, 1917.

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF JANUARY, 1918.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF FEBRUARY, 1918.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF MARCH, 1918.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF APRIL, 1918.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF MAY, 1918.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF JUNE, 1918.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF JULY, 1918.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF AUGUST, 1918.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF SEPTEMBER, 1918.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF OCTOBER, 1918.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF NOVEMBER, 1918.
THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE MONTH OF DECEMBER, 1918.

CLARK'S

FOREIGN

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

FOURTH SERIES.

VOL. XXXII.

History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Testament.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

MDCCCLXXI.

PRINTED BY MURRAY AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, C. SCRIBNER AND CO.

HISTORY
OF
THE KINGDOM OF GOD
UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

E. W. HENGSTENBERG,

LATE DOCTOR AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN BERLIN.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
MDCCCLXXI.

BS

1197

. H3 8613

1871

Vol. 1

~~BT~~
~~94~~
~~44~~
~~1~~
~~C2~~

CONTENTS.



INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

1. Nature, Extent, Name, Division, Import, and Method of treating the History of the Old Testament, . . .	1
2. Sources of Old Testament History, . . .	21
3. Aids to Old Testament History, . . .	79

FIRST PERIOD.

FROM ABRAHAM TO MOSES.

§ 1. The Condition of the Human Race at the time of Abraham's Call.	
1. In a Political Aspect,	90
2. In a Religious Aspect,	115
§ 2. History of Abraham.	
1. Abraham's Call,	124
2. Abraham in Egypt,	130
3. Abraham's Separation from Lot,	134
4. Abraham's Warlike Expedition.—Melchizedek,	135
5. God's Covenant with Abraham,	141
6. Abraham and Hagar,	143
7. The Promise of Isaac,	144
8. The Appearance of the Lord at Mamre,	146
9. The Destruction of Sodom,	149
10. Isaac's Birth and Ishmael's Expulsion,	158
11. The Temptation of Abraham,	159
12. Sarah's Death,	165
13. Isaac's Marriage,	166
14. Abraham's Death,	167
§ 3. Isaac,	172
1. Birth of Jacob and Esau,	174
2. Transactions relative to the Birthright, or Jacob's Cun- ning and Esau's Roughness,	176
3. Isaac's Blessing,	178

	PAGE
§ 4. Jacob.	
1. Jacob at Bethel,	181
2. Jacob in Mesopotamia,	183
3. Jacob's Wrestling,	186
4. The Crime of Jacob's Sons at Sichem,	190
§ 5. Joseph,	191
§ 6. Remarks on Government, Manners, and Culture,	202
§ 7. Of the Religious Knowledge of the Patriarchs,	207
§ 8. Of the External Worship of God among the Patriarchs,	216

SECOND PERIOD.

THE PERIOD OF THE LAW, FROM MOSES TO THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

FIRST SECTION.

MOSES.

§ 1. Introduction.—The Condition of the Israelites in Egypt before the Time of Moses,	234
1. Concerning their External and Civil Relations,	234
2. Concerning their Religious and Moral Condition,	243
§ 2. The Call of Moses,	248
§ 3. The Deliverance out of Egypt,	264
§ 4. The March through the Wilderness until the giving of the Law on Sinai,	293
§ 5. The Covenant on Sinai,	311
§ 6. Other Occurrences on Sinai,	336
§ 7. From the breaking up on Sinai to the Death of Moses,	374

SECOND SECTION.

HISTORY OF JOSHUA.

§ 1. From the Death of Moses to the Conquest of Jericho,	403
§ 2. From the taking of Jericho to the Division of the Land,	420
§ 3. The Division of the Land,	449
§ 4. Return of the trans-Jordanic Tribes.—Joshua's Last Exhorta- tions.—Accounts given in other places of the History of Joshua.—Condition of the Israelites under him,	460

HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.



BEFORE entering on the history of the kingdom of God under the Old Testament, it will be necessary to make a few introductory inquiries relative to its nature, extent, name, division, import, and method of treatment.

The history is divided into two great parts, the history of the kingdom of nature, and the history of the kingdom of grace. The ground of separation is formed by the different relation in which God stands to the world since the fall, already indicated in the Old Testament by the different names Elohim and Jehovah. The relation which God bears to the whole world is that of creator, preserver, and ruler. This is the kingdom of nature. It is divided, according to the condition of the creatures of God, into two parts, the kingdom of bondage and the kingdom of freedom. The former is a question of natural history in its stricter sense; the latter of civil, profane, world-history. One of its chief tasks is to point out how the providence and sovereignty of God reveal themselves in the destinies of nations and of those individuals who have exercised special influence on the whole; how all the changes of origin and decay are under His direction, and especially how His retributive justice checks the abuse of freedom, punishes it, and humiliates everything which arrogantly presumes to place itself in opposition to Him (one need only recollect Shakspeare's

historical pieces, in which this forms the centre in prefiguration of all higher historical composition); finally, to show how all His arrangements have the ultimate and higher aim to prepare, establish, and confirm the kingdom of grace in humanity. While, therefore, profane history has to do with the universal providence of God; the history of the kingdom of grace has to do with His special providence. The idea of grace, in so far as it is restoration, stands in necessary relation to the idea of sin. (As mercy presupposes misery, so grace presupposes sin.) As soon as sin had once found entrance into the world, as soon as the image of God had been lost or obscured, a return to God became impossible unless God Himself would enter into humanity, unless He Himself would reunite the bond which had been torn asunder by the guilt of man; and would found a kingdom of holiness and righteousness in opposition to the kingdom of sin which had its origin in the fall. The history of the kingdom of grace is therefore the history of the peculiar arrangements of God for restoring the happiness which had been forfeited by the fall; and in necessary connection with it, the history of the way in which men as free personal beings upon whom salvation cannot be forced, but to whom it is offered for acceptance or rejection, demeaned themselves towards it, whether they accepted or rejected it.

The centre of God's decrees for the salvation of man was from the beginning in Christ. But in order that His appearance might effect that which it was calculated to produce in accordance with the condition of men upon whom happiness was not to be forced, it was preceded by a long period of preparation; of direct preparation with regard to one nation chosen for this purpose; of indirect preparation when all other nations were concerned, although civil, not sacred history has to do with the latter. Thus God's measures of salvation, and therefore their history, is divided into two great parts: the time of preparation; and the time of fulfilment, called by Paul in Gal. iv. 4 the *πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου*. These two parts have very aptly been termed the economies or dispensations. Because every relation of grace into which God enters with all humanity, or with a single nation, or with an individual, is in the language of Scripture designated a covenant,—a term which implies that

God never gives without requiring; that with every new grace the question simultaneously arises, I do this for thee, what dost thou for me? that all unions into which God enters are not of a pathological, but of an ethical nature: therefore the first economy has been called that of the Old Testament, the second that of the New Testament. Their essential distinction consists in the fact, that the former is based upon the promised and future Christ, the latter upon the manifested Christ; the former is the gradual progressive preparation of salvation in Christ, the latter is the appearance of this salvation from its beginning to its final and glorious fulfilment. In this main distinction the others have their origin.

With reference to the extent of the first part, the older theologians universally begin the history of the Old Testament with the creation of the world, and carry it on to the birth of Christ. Against the starting-point which they take there is the less to be objected, since in this respect they follow the sacred records themselves. If we designate the first economy as the economy of preparation, it must not be forgotten that already in the first history of the human race there is much which may fitly be regarded as preparatory. Thus, for example, the divine sentence of punishment after the fall, and, still more, the punishment itself, was designed to awaken in man the consciousness of sin, and consequently to prepare him for the revelation of grace. In like manner the deluge was intended to set limits, at least for a time, to the depravity which was increasing with rapid strides, in order that at the beginning of the special revelations of God all susceptibility for their reception might not have disappeared. Thus the confusion of tongues, which had its origin in the diversity of minds, served, by scattering the various nations, to impede the communication of evil, and to guard against the development of a common spirit, or universalism in sin. But the main thing, the proof of the development of sin, to which chief attention is directed in the sacred records from Adam to Abraham—the reference to it forms the soul of Genesis, chaps. i.–xi.—furnishes that series of the more definite arrangements of God which began with Abraham, with the best basis for the foundation of the kingdom of grace, for preparation of Christ's manifestation. When we remember

how sin which entered into the world by the fall even in early times attained to such fearful power as to cause fratricide, how before long it gave rise to a nation which sought its honour in barbarity and violence, how by degrees it drew down into its whirlpool the *ἐκλογή* who had remained from the beginning, how it attained such supremacy that with the exception of a few individuals it became necessary to destroy the whole race of man, how among the descendants of the few who had been rescued forgetfulness of God soon broke forth anew on an enlarged scale; the measures which God had arranged for salvation, beginning with Abraham, appear in their true significance; their absolute necessity becomes manifest; and hence that which proves the necessity for the economy of preparation may itself be regarded as an element of its history. Through Adam's fall human nature was completely corrupted; this is the key to an understanding of God's plan of salvation. Thus the beginning with Adam is not unsuitable if we regard the first economy as the economy of preparation. And even if we regard it as the economy of promise, there is a good argument in favour of this starting-point also. For the promise begins immediately after the fall, though the promised One does not stand out with clearness; which was the case even in the promises to Abraham and Isaac. In the judicial sentence on the tempter, which has reference to the invisible cause more than to the visible instrument, there is certainly a promise to the betrayed human race of future victory over their betrayer, and over the sin he introduced. And this promise is more nearly defined soon after the deluge, in Gen. ix. 26, 27, where it is stated that the promised salvation is to originate with the descendants of Shem, and from them to pass over to the posterity of his brethren. Whatever little reason there is, after what we have said, for rejecting this earlier starting-point, we have come to the conclusion on many accounts to adopt another, the call of Abraham. Our outward and subjective argument is based upon the wish to secure for ourselves the possibility of a thorough treatment, by the greatest possible restrictions of our space within the narrow limits which recent times accord to academic lectures, especially on this subject (Rambach read five semesters on the church history of the Old Testament),

and at the same time not to encroach too much on another lecture, that on Genesis, in which it will be necessary to treat the history from the creation to Abraham's call with particular fulness. An additional argument is drawn from the subject itself, viz. that the proper founding of the Old Testament, the proper establishment of the kingdom of God upon earth, the economy of preparation begins with the call of Abraham; so that when the earlier history is concerned, it is sufficient to draw attention to the manner in which it serves as a preparation for this founding and establishment. Against the concluding-point of the older theologians there is one objection to be made, namely, if we follow Scripture we find that the perfect end of the economy of the Old Testament consists not in the birth, but in the mediatorial death of Christ, and in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, which takes place as a consequence of the altered relation of God towards the world, effected by Christ's death. Forgiveness of sins and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost are already cited by the prophets, especially by Jeremiah in the classic passage chap. xxxi. 31, etc., as essential marks of the appearance of the Messianic kingdom, and of the abrogation of the Old Testament. The Lord Himself and His disciples kept the law until His mediatorial death; and Paul makes the abrogation of the Old Testament date from the same event,—the Lord Himself declares the New Testament to be first instituted by His blood, and to rest in it. But although the efficacy of Christ certainly belongs to the time of the economy of the Old Testament, yet, in accordance with the nature of the question, it belongs specially to the economy of the New Testament, since it professes to be the necessary foundation of the facts which ushered in the revelation of this economy. In it we find the New Testament silently germinating in the time of the Old Testament. *Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, with this fact those others were also given which led on directly to the cessation of the Old Testament. The Lord Himself, in Matt. xi. 13, *πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἕως Ἰωάννου προεφήτευσαν*, points to the appearance of the Baptist, so closely connected with His own, as the great turning-point, when the time of promise and preparation begins to give way to the time of fulfilment. Therefore we exclude the history of Christ.

On the other hand, it will not be irrelevant if, by way of appendix, we give the history of those events which, with revelation generally, lie properly without the limits of the history of the Old Testament, together with the history of the Jews from the rejection of Christ, by which they cease to be a covenant-people, to the destruction of Jerusalem. For these events throw light upon the kingdom of God under Israel, being a consequence of it, and a divine judgment which befell the former covenant-people, or more correctly their *caput mortuum*,—for the ἐκλογὴ formed the stem of the church of the New Testament,—because they had violated the conditions of the covenant which had been made. Because they are a consequence of the sovereignty of God they cannot be entirely abandoned to profane history, which is properly occupied only with the universal rule of God. Therefore we exclude the point where the New Testament passes on into the Old Testament, and on the other hand include the point where the Old Testament passes on into the New Testament.

In earlier theological phraseology the history of the Old Testament was universally termed the *Historia Ecclesiastica V. T.* This appellation rests upon the conviction, entirely conformable to Scripture, that the kingdom of God upon earth was not perhaps begun with Christ, but only completed; that from the time of Abraham there existed a true church of God, into which the heathen only were received; that from the commencement of the institutions of salvation till the end of the world there is but one people of God, the sons of Abraham and Israel, from whose communion unbelief and unfaithfulness exclude even those who belong thereto by birth; in accordance with the expression so often repeated in the law, “This soul is rooted up out of his land.” But on the other hand faith admits every one to equal privileges with those who are born into this community. This is a position so firmly established in the writings of the Old Testament, especially the prophetic, and in the utterances of Christ and His apostles, that it can only be contested by complete or partial disbelief in revelation. The Saviour speaks from this point of view when, in Matt. xix. 28, He says to the apostles, “Verily, I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon

twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." That the twelve tribes of Israel are not here named in the ordinary Jewish sense, but are intended to denote the whole church, is as certain as that the calling of the apostles has reference not to Jews alone, but to "all nations," Matt. xxviii. 19. Even in the choice of the apostles the Lord is led by this mode of consideration, as certainly as that the number twelve has reference to the twelve tribes of Israel. In Rom. xi. 17-24, Paul recognises only one olive tree, one people of God, from whom unbelievers are excluded, and to whose fellowship faith admits all. James follows the same course of thought when he addresses his epistle to the "twelve tribes which are scattered abroad," etc.; and Peter, when he writes to the "strangers scattered throughout Pontus," etc. It is certain that neither of them had any wish to exclude the heathen Christians, who, according to the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles, were at that time associated with the Jewish Christians in the Christian church; and just as little did they wish to include unchristian Jews. They address themselves to the true original sons, and to the adopted sons. John pursues the same course of thought in the Apocalypse, chap. xxi. 12, when he says that on the twelve gates of the city, which represents the church in the kingdom of glory, of the city in whose light even the heathen walk (chap. xxi. 24), are written names which are the twelve tribes of the children of Israel. Therefore the title of *Hist. Eccl. V. T.* has some significance in itself, and can only be objected to on one ground. According to the usual phraseology, which has a sound basis, the church is placed in opposition to the state. By this view, only the history of the kingdom of God under the New Testament can come under the name of Church History. For, properly speaking, an antithesis of church and state did not exist under the Old Testament, but both were inseparably joined together according to an arrangement of God, which had respect to the necessities of the Old Testament. The main argument lies in this, that the kingdom of God under the Old Testament possessed, in the spirit of Christ, no mighty principle involving the possibility of an unconditioned independent existence, but was obliged to look to the state for support. State and church formed only different sides of one and the same collective life.

But we are not to understand that they formed really different sides, after the example of those who confound theocracy with hierarchy; for it is manifest that the various elements of divine sovereignty under the Old Testament are distinct: the priests have nothing to do with the civil government, but restricted themselves solely to the sphere of religion which they share with the prophets; while the civil rulers and the prophets occupy in their own sphere a position as independent and absolute as that of the priests. The distinction between the Old and New Testament is only apparently obviated by the consideration that even under the New Testament the church has various ramifications with the state. For where we find not a mere covenant but an actual union existing between church and state, as for example in the State Church of England; it is a result not of God's institution, but of the sin of men, and therefore does not belong to the essence of the church of the New Testament, but can only be regarded as a perversion of it. In most cases, however, this intimate connection is only apparent, as for example in the Evangelical Church of Germany after its first establishment. But the fact that union with the state does not belong to the proper essence of the church of the New Testament is most clearly evidenced by the example of those Christian churches which have no connection with the state, as all Christian churches in America, Dissenters in England, the Free Church in Scotland, and among ourselves the Moravians and Separatist-Lutherans. Under the Old Testament such a community would have sunk helplessly. We infer this from the absolute dependence of religious life under the Old Testament on the personal piety of kings. Even under the New Testament a glorious blessing is attached to this piety; but it has not its former absolute influence. Nevertheless the Old Testament name of Church History is much more expressive of the thing than that which has become prevalent in the age of rationalism, viz. History of the Jews or Hebrew History, which leaves the main element untouched, the very thing which makes this history a theological discipline, the special revelation of God to this people. The appellation History of Theocracy is also objectionable, because this term, so popular among supranaturalist apologists, and indeed first originated in the apologetic region—

it was introduced by Josephus—has acquired a profane, secondary signification. The Jewish historian generally uses theocracy of an ideal sovereignty; our historians speak of theocracy among the Egyptians, etc. It may also be objected to this appellation that it places the Old and New Testaments in an erroneous antithesis not known to Scripture at all: under the New Testament God is Lord and King, and only one particular form of His sovereignty is proper to the Old Testament. More suitable is the title, History of the Kingdom of God under Israel; but still better, perhaps the best, is the title, History of the Old Covenant, or of the Kingdom of God under the Old Covenant, because it not only, like the first, indicates its peculiar character, but at the same time specifies its connection with the history of the kingdom of God under the New Testament; and again because the term Israel is ambiguous, it cannot with propriety be applied only to the people of the old covenant.

As to the division of the Old Testament history, it falls naturally into two parts: the history of the period from Abraham's call to Moses; and the history of the period from Moses to Christ. Yet in recent times these two parts have not unfrequently been placed in a false relation to one another, as Sack has well shown in his *Apologetik*; the first having been characterized as a mere preparation for the law, the second, as a preparation by the law for Christ; while in the New Testament, on the other hand, the close connection between the covenant with the patriarchs and the New Testament is made peculiarly prominent; and the law is designated only as an intermediate arrangement: comp. *e.g.* Gal. iii. 21-24. The covenant with the patriarchs unquestionably served at the same time as a preparation for the law; but this is not the chief aspect in which it should be regarded. The chief element in the covenant concluded with the patriarchs is, properly speaking, the promise that from their posterity salvation should go forth to all nations. Under the law itself this promise was even more clearly and definitely evolved through the medium of the prophets. Christ is the essence of prophecy. The law stands only in a subordinate relation to the promise, serving only as a means to facilitate its realization, and to call forth that necessity for redemption which is its basis. Therefore the greatest importance must be attached to the first part, and to that portion of the second

which is connected with it; although the second part, owing to its greater copiousness, and to the outward magnificence of the events connected with it, as well as to its longer duration, occupies much more space.

Of these parts the second contains several subdivisions, corresponding to transition-points of special importance; both parts may be divided into the external and internal history. The former takes cognizance of the changes which took place in the outward condition of the bearers of revelation, specifies their fortunate or unfortunate relations with respect to other nations, and describes the life and character of those men who exercised special influence on the development of the nation; the latter represents the civil, moral, and religious condition of the people, examines the substance of the revelations committed to them at every period, defines the measure of religious perception, and the mode of worshipping God at each period; and together with the history of true religion gives an account of the origin of false religions, especially of idolatrous worship among the covenant-people. The representation of the theology of the Old Testament, thus given in connection with history, is more appropriate than the separate treatment of it which has so often been attempted. For under the old dispensation doctrine had not yet elevated itself to independence, but was intimately bound up with history. Occasionally it became prominent, and was contained in a series of divine deeds, directions, and institutions, or appeared in connection with them. The separate treatment of the doctrine of faith and morals contained in the Old Testament overlooks this its characteristic distinction from the New Testament. A work so purely dogmatic as the Epistle to the Romans could not have been written under the Old Testament.

We shall now treat of the aim and import of the history of the Old Testament; first, in so far as it is an independent theological discipline; secondly, in its character as a science auxiliary to other portions of theology. The chief advantage of the Old Testament history is that it confirms us in the faith, and provides us with the means of confirming others in it. This happens in many ways, but especially in so far as it proves the inner coherence of all the divine preparations for salvation, the progress from the smaller to the greater, from systematic

preparation to completion and fulfilment. It is by the perception of this very connection that many are first brought to the conviction that revelation cannot possibly be a human invention: and from the knowledge of it the believer continually gathers new confidence and strength. The believer has special need of strength at this time, when a host of apparent objections attempts to shake the faith not merely in this fact, but in revelation generally. He cannot meet the temptations which arise otherwise than by profound study of the history of the Old Testament. For it alone can prove that those events which, taken separately, often appear inconsistent, ridiculous, and unworthy of God, are found, when placed in connection with the whole, to contain a glorious revelation of the divine omnipotence, wisdom, and love. What Pliny says of nature, "*Naturæ rerum vis atque majestas in omnibus momentis fide caret, si quis modo partes ejus ac non totum complectatur animo,*" is applicable to the kingdom of grace in a still stronger degree. The history of the Old Testament also serves to confirm faith, so far as it demonstrates an essential unity of doctrine through so many centuries, and amid such a multitude of authors writing under the most varied circumstances and outward influences; showing that at all times the same ideas of God and of the world were prevalent among the bearers of revelation, and that no contradiction ever took place. It also points out how, even in the first beginnings of revelation, all those doctrines were present, at least in germ, which afterwards, when the people of revelation had become ripe for them, appeared in full development. This perception is the more calculated to impress us with a lively sense of the divinity of revelation; the more distinctly do we recognise the changeableness and inconsistency of all human systems and self-made religions. In the region of nature all things are in a state of transition, and everything has its own time. Unity must therefore make the deeper impression the less it is identity: the more it is organic the more clearly we can throughout recognise a healthy and normal growth, without disturbances and defect in development, the more clearly we can perceive its freedom from error, and prove a building up of the highest step even upon the lowest, and at the same time a gradual progress. Further, the more plainly it can be demonstrated that the pro-

gress is everywhere in harmony with the necessity and requirements of the people of revelation. To this may be added the fact, that in the history of the Old Testament God's special providence over His whole church, and over individual believers, appeared in a form more visible, and as it were palpable, than even in the New Testament, when God, after having so perfectly and unconditionally revealed Himself in Christ, could hide Himself the more ("he wieldeth his power in secret" is especially applicable to the New Testament time); and when the greater internal efficacy of the Spirit makes such an external manifestation no longer necessary; a fact which is also for our benefit in the Old Testament times. Why should it not powerfully strengthen faith in attacks causing distress to the whole church and to individuals, if we see how God for many centuries allowed His people to be oppressed in order to purify them, without ever suffering them to be crushed; how He rescued them through mighty wonders of His omnipotence, where no human help was possible; how He fulfilled all His promises most gloriously just when hope of their fulfilment had utterly disappeared? If even under the Old Testament, as we find from numerous passages in the Psalms and prophetic books, comp. *e.g.* the 3d chapter of Habakkuk and Ps. lxxvii., faith drew from previous deliverances the firm conviction that God could, must, and would prove Himself an equally powerful helper in time of present need, why should not our faith draw the same conclusion from the same premises, for we have before us the whole series of divine deliverances and proofs of grace, as well as the ultimate fulfilment of all promises through the coming of Christ? We require this confirmation of faith in the present time the more as the condition of the church is more oppressed and dangerous, and as the visible presents us with fewer bright prospects. There is certainly no reason why we should rob ourselves of a single God-given help to our faith.

The history of the Old Testament also serves for a living apprehension of the being and attributes of God, and therefore supplies that which properly makes the theologian a theologian. Nothing else can compensate for this view of the personality of God: speculation cannot, for at best it only furnishes us with abstract ideas of God, lifeless conceptions, for whose reality

it can offer no security ; neither can the history of Christ in its isolation, for it does not afford us on every side a perfect view of the personality of God, and is so closely connected with the earlier revelations of God that without knowledge of them its inherent efficacy cannot be accurately estimated. We see this daily in the wretched examples of those who separate what God has united. It is this intuitive knowledge of the personality of God which alone can kindle our love to God, can inspire us with holy awe of Him, and can call forth in us the striving after a divine life ; while the mere abstract theory of God is cold, leaves us cold, or even makes us so. Whoever neglects the history of the Old Testament deprives himself of one instrument toward the fulfilment of the first and greater commandment, viz. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," and makes himself incapable of leading others to its observance.

But just as the history of the Old Testament gives us a living knowledge of God, and inspires us with love to Him, it also leads us to the knowledge of ourselves, and makes us long to be freed from ourselves. The history of the people of Israel, of the nature of their relations to divine revelations, and of their frequent apostasy even after they had experienced proofs of the divine grace, is a mirror of our own inner life. It repeats itself in every age and in every individual. In it the *tua res agitur* is visible throughout. This mode of handling the old covenant meets us frequently even in the Old Testament. Thus, for example, in Ps. lxxviii., Asaph, in his own person, is held up to the people of God, as a mirror in which they might see their own faces, their history, which was written for this very purpose. In the New Testament the same thing occurs in the discourse of Stephen. So in 1 Cor. x. 6, where it is said of the people of the Old Testament, in relation to the church of the New, *τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν*. This history is to us a rich source of humility, a loud exhortation that we should work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, since our heart, like that of Israel, is a perverse and coward thing. But it shows us at the same time in the life of individuals what we may and should become, the more impressively in proportion as the helps to a divine life which were available at that time were few in comparison with those offered to us to whom Christ is openly set forth, and which we possess

in the Spirit of Christ, the potentiality of the Spirit of God : it furnishes us with noble examples of the highest faith and of the most fervent love to God. In this last respect its significance is set forth by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. xi.

The following is also an important consideration. The New Testament has especially to do with the relation of the Lord to individual souls and to His church. On the other hand, the Old Testament has a prevailing national character. In the history of one single nation it brings to our consciousness the dealings of God in the guidance of the nations generally, shows us upon what their salvation and destruction rested, relieves us with respect to the future from the torment of our own thoughts, and gives us the basis of a solid knowledge. We wish to know what will become of our people, how they are to be helped, and what is our duty in relation to them ; on which points we gain instruction from the Old Testament. The energetic efficiency of divine justice which is there set forth guards us against participation in those sanguine illusions of the time which promise salvation without repentance, while we are kept from enervating despair by the glorious revelation of that divine grace which after judgment and by judgment makes life proceed from death.

So much for the import of the Old Testament as an independent discipline. That it is able to perform what we have attributed to it in this respect, may be proved from innumerable examples in every age. Luther's "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott" is not in vain attached to the 46th Psalm. It is the sum of that which he had learnt from the history of the Old Testament. Let any one now inquire into the position with respect to the Old Testament of those who stand fast, as well as of those who waver and totter, and he will find that the distinction between them has its root in this, that the former have the rock of the Old Testament under their feet. Let us now say a few words on the value of this discipline as a science auxiliary to other theological disciplines. The biblical science of Introduction is certainly on our side auxiliary to biblical history. It does for it what a knowledge of sources does for profane history, secures to it the use of those sources from which it has to create, and consequently its ground and basis. For its own credibility rests upon the authority of these sources.

Yet from another point of view biblical history may be regarded as an auxiliary science to Introduction. It only can supply materials for the internal proof of the genuineness and credibility of the separate biblical books, for it alone avails to carry us back to the time of their origin ; it alone can give us an insight into the historical ground and basis upon which the authors stood and worked. History stands in a similar relation to the exegesis of the Old Testament also. Exegesis provides it with the greater part of its materials ; while, on the other hand, it renders the most important services to exegesis. It secures the expositor from arbitrary twisting and interpretation of those narratives which transcend the usual course of nature, making him aware that in this respect the divine mode of revelation remained the same for a thousand years ; while at the same time it deprives him of all desire for such attempts by disclosing to him the inner necessity for these facts, which can only be perceived from their connection with the whole. It also shows that that which is wonderful in respect of form is most natural in respect of substance ; and that in this historical connection it must first be postulated that its non-existence would be matter of surprise. On the other hand, it saves the expositor from a crude apprehension of the form of many facts transcending the limits of the moral, by proving to him that in the region of Scripture a wider margin is given to the inner sense, so that he must not at once regard every event of which the contrary is not expressly stated as a gross external thing, belonging to the department of the five senses. It also provides him with a clue to historical interpretation. Especially important is it in this respect for understanding the prophetic writings, which must be explained by the time of their origin, and upon which light is thrown by the fulfilment of prophecy. The same may be said with reference to the interpretation of the Psalms ; since it leads us to seek out their authors, and explains the historical references. The more historically and individually we understand the Psalms, the more do they acquire an edifying signification. In this way alone can we rightly apprehend their meaning. Where the historical books of the Old Testament are concerned, especially those which it is not usual to explain in academic lectures, Old Testament history takes the place of a real com-

mentary. Its importance for exegesis is self-evident. The New Testament is, generally speaking, only the key-stone and completion ; it rests entirely upon earlier revelation ; and where this is not thoroughly apprehended, the understanding of its records must remain extremely deficient, not only in one but in every respect, for even that which in the New Testament appears most independent, is in some way, directly or indirectly, theologically connected with the Old Testament. We may say that the key-stone to the understanding of the New Testament is a perception of its connection with the Old. The Gospel of John, *e.g.*, is from beginning to end interwoven with deeply concealed references to the Old Testament. And when these significant references are not apprehended, as for example in the commentaries of Lücke, De Wette, and Meyer, exposition generally can occupy only a subordinate position. At every step in such commentaries we have the feeling that we are following a guide not competent for his task. The history of the Old Testament would therefore be indispensable to the exegesis of the New, even if the latter were not indebted to it for its most important aid to historical interpretation, viz. a knowledge of the religious and moral condition of the people at the time of the appearance of Christ, of their relation to other nations, of the various schools and sects among them, and of the character of the expectations which were current respecting the Messiah. Among the other theological disciplines apologetics owe most to the history of the Old Testament. If we limit this science, as many have done in modern times, to a systematic representation of the arguments for the divine mission of Christ, the history of the Old Testament is important so far as it provides it with material for the demonstration of one of its most important proofs of the harmony of that fulfilment of salvation which took place in Christ with the preparation for it under the Old Testament. If we attribute to it the scientific defence of revelation generally, the history of the Old Testament becomes even more indispensable ; it is then entirely dependent on history in one of its leading parts, and is distinguished from it only by a different form and mode of treatment.

We must speak, finally, of the consistent mode of treating

biblical history. In general, whatever the mode of treatment may be, it arises from what has already been remarked concerning the import and object of biblical history. The representation must be such that those advantages which the history is able to afford may really be attained as far as possible. It must therefore have its principal aim constantly in view, that which, as an independent discipline, it professes to accomplish, and must not so far lose itself in learned details as to interfere with this aim, lest it should become a mere aggregate of detached notices, and thus lose all title to the name of an independent theological discipline. In this respect many have gone far astray—among the ancients Buddeus, among moderns Kurtz. They enter too minutely into details, and have no clear consciousness of the limits between the history and exegesis of the Old Testament. The history of the Old Testament must not, however, overlook these details; it must treat of the special Mosaic laws, of the separate events of the life of David; and must not forego theological inquiries, lest it should incapacitate itself for doing that which, as an auxiliary science, it ought to accomplish. A special demand arises, for him who elaborates the Old Testament, out of the relation which modern time has assumed towards the Old Testament. With regard to this question more than any other—in consequence of a century's work of learned neology—a mass of prejudices, distorted views, and false arguments concerning and against the Old Testament generally, and the most important portions of its history in particular, have become prevalent, not only among the enemies of revelation, but also among the better intentioned who are really interested in arriving at truth and removing the contradiction which exists between their judgment concerning the Old Testament and that of Christ and the apostles. If it be the general task of theology to provide future servants of the church with means by which they may be able to justify, prove, and defend the faith before itself and others, the history of the Old Testament cannot consistently shrink from the duty of expressly contradicting these prejudices, in so far as they have apparent weight or value. On the other hand, care must be taken not to attach undue importance to this apologetic and polemic tendency, lest the total impression from without should be weakened; for the matter

as it stands in itself, without reference to the way in which this one or that one has treated it, can only be apprehended by one mode of treatment. It will not be out of place here to draw attention to a fundamental idea throughout the history of the Old Testament which must be kept in view, which satisfactorily solves its greatest difficulties, and fills us with admiration of the divine love and wisdom, while he who is incapable of its perception sees only error and foolishness. This is the idea of the divine condescension, the *συγκατάβασις*, which has been profoundly and accurately apprehended by many of the church-fathers—Chrysostom for example. Its recognition becomes necessary so soon as the relation of the finite creation to the infinite Creator, the relation of sinful man to the holy God, is rightly apprehended; a truth which can only be grasped by each one as far as he walks in the light of revelation, and partakes of the Spirit of God. Man, as a finite being, can only apprehend the infinite God when He conceals the full splendour of His Godhead, and reveals His nature by means of finite forms. With the entrance of sin into the world the necessity for this condescension greatly increased; the deeper man sinks, the more he becomes entangled in matter and estranged from God; the more gross and, as it were, palpable must be the form in which God can approach him and resume the interrupted intercourse, until by degrees man becomes capable of entering into a more spiritual union with God. To reject this condescension of God, of which the fundamental condition is sinlessness, as in the deepest condescension of God in Christ, is therefore virtually to maintain that God ought to have abandoned man to misery. Such an assumption shows equal ignorance of God, of His love and mercy, and of man; and can only be entertained by one who has made himself his own God and his own man; a doubtful undertaking, since both continue what they are. It is a real denial of the *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*. For if this deepest condescension of God have any reality, it can only be the last link of a chain of condescensions. If we hold fast the idea of the divine condescension, we shall also on the other hand happily avoid the undeniable mistakes common to the more ancient elaborators of sacred history. They did not consider that although it is impossible for God to contradict Himself in His revelations, yet these, in order to be

suitable, must differ according to the various requirements and receptivity of those to whom they were imparted; the earlier revelations must contain much only in germ and concealed, which is fully developed and assumes a definite form in the later. In most cases expositors set aside the distinction between the New and Old Testaments, attributing, *e.g.*, to the patriarchs exactly the same knowledge of salvation as to the apostles. In striving after a gain which was only apparent, they lost much; the *πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Eph. iii. 10, and the *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* in Heb. i. 1, drew off their attention; and the unhistorical attempt to change unity into identity called forth a reaction which still continues, whose tendency was completely to destroy the unity. It is with great injustice that I have been frequently accused of participation in this older position with regard to the Old Testament, *e.g.* by Oehler, *Prolegomena zur Theol. des A. T.*, Stuttg. 1845. I am thoroughly convinced, with those who make this accusation, "that the New Testament is contained in the Old, and for this reason exists in it, as in every higher organism the higher development is already present as germ or prototype in the earlier." The real difference between us consists only in this, that with them the process of development is disturbed by manifold defects and abnormalities, while with me, on the contrary, it is healthy throughout; that in the law and the prophets they feel themselves bound to accept not only ideas which are correct, but also many which are incorrect and limited, while I attribute to knowledge generally, imperfection it is true, but nevertheless freedom from error. On which side the truth lies has already been predetermined by the authority of our Lord, who certainly does not speak from the opposite point of view when He explains the Mosaic law as inviolable to an iota and tittle; declaring that the Scripture of the Old Testament cannot be broken. The unanimous judgment of the Christian church has also come to a previous decision on this subject. The Old Testament would never have been able to assume its position as a codex of the divine revelations intended for the whole community if the problem had been first to separate the chaff from the wheat by means of theological operations. The *γέγραπται* with which the Lord meets Satan in the temptation, loses its meaning in this event.

Another aspect which is very important for the history of the Old Testament is the following. The historical books narrate things, as a rule, quite objectively. They communicate facts purely and sharply; they represent characters in their main features in an inimitably striking way, and abstain from passing any judgment—a mode of representation which we find almost universal in the historical books of the New Testament also. Their deepest argument seems to be this, that the human forms only a subordinate element of sacred history. Their glance is immoveably fixed upon the great acts of the Lord. They write as theologians, not as moralists and critics. And further, the sacred writers are the more readily satisfied with a simple representation of matters of fact, since a judgment may generally be inferred from the historical consequences; and such real judgment speaks far more powerfully to the heart than one put in words. Thus, it would appear quite superfluous in Genesis to pass a condemnatory judgment on Jacob's cunning towards Esau and Isaac; for the striking retribution by which he was overtaken indicates with sufficient clearness in what light the matter is to be considered. Finally, holy Scripture is throughout written for exercised spiritual minds, or is so arranged that they will be exercised. The emphatic demands frequently uttered by the Lord on separate occasions,—Who hath ears to hear, let him hear; Let him that readeth understand; He who is able to understand, let him understand,—are everywhere present, though unseen. Understanding and correct judgment are not forced upon us; it is not intended that we should avow misunderstandings at any cost; but our spiritual judgment is awakened to the danger of misunderstandings.

The older theologians were always inclined to palliate and excuse, if not entirely to justify the mistakes and infirmities of the heroes of the faith, unless the Scripture narrative was accompanied by express disapproval. This was not, however, the invariable and universal mode of dealing—Calvin, Heidegger, and Rambach in part, formed praiseworthy exceptions. On the other hand, the opponents of the Old Testament,—e.g. the author of the *Continued Fragments of the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist*, edited by Schmidt, Berlin 1787; Bohlen, in his *Commentary on Genesis*,—partly taking advantage of the distorted

mode of treatment common to older theologians, thought that in exposing these mistakes and infirmities they dealt the Old Testament a fatal blow. The following is doubtless the correct mode of treatment. Proceeding from the fundamental axiom which lies at the basis of all sacred history, that honour is due to God alone, to us shame and confusion; we should judge the actions of the Old Testament believers, if we must pass judgment on them, and those of the Old Testament unbelievers, by the standard which holy Scripture itself supplies, that standard with which no praise or blame which it expressly utters is ever at variance. The endeavour to make the believers of the Old Testament into perfect saints is the more uncertain, since it must inevitably lead to misapprehension of the characteristic distinction between the Old and New Testaments which even Christ lays down in this respect when He says, the less in the kingdom of heaven, viz. the comparatively little, he who there occupies only a subordinate position (not the least, for that would give an incorrect idea), is greater than the greatest under the Old Testament.

2. Sources of the Old Testament History.

The sources of Old Testament history are partly native, partly foreign. The former are by far the most important; the latter are of comparatively little use. A great portion of the history dates far beyond the time in which history and historiography began among the other nations of antiquity. Even for later times foreign sources can afford little material. The Israelitish people had in consequence of their religion kept themselves so much apart, that it would have been impossible for any stranger to gain an adequate knowledge of their religion, constitution, and history. Surrounding nations despised the small, politically unimportant people, who, when oppressed on every side, and even after their political existence had been destroyed, still believed themselves to have the preference over other nations; and their contempt was the greater, since this preference was most emphatically asserted by those who least participated in it, comp. Rom. ii. 17, etc.; of whom it is there said that they are Jews, and yet not Jews, but a synagogue of Satan, Rev. ii. 9, iii. 9. Their pride was ridiculed, and they were esteemed beneath notice. The

heathen could not apprehend their history in the right light, because, as we see daily in modern heathendom, they were deficient in that spiritual eye which was necessary for the perception of what was soul-exciting in them, and all else had little charm or beauty: they abandoned themselves to the most odious and absurd fictions. Moreover it was after history had become degraded that the Jews first became an object of lively interest to the heathen; but of this we find no trace, even in a Herodotus—attention was first directed towards them after the time of Alexander, and was due to the ever-widening extension of the Jewish διασπορά; and those who more nearly occupied themselves with them were rather beneath the age, were almost all writers of the lowest class. To this must be added the fact, that all the works of those who *ex professo* wrote concerning the Jews have been lost, with the exception of comparatively small fragments.

So much the more copious are the home sources. Among them the historical books of the Old Testament take the first place: for pre-Mosaic and Mosaic times the Pentateuch has most importance; for the post-Mosaic time until Samuel, the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth; for the history of the kings, the books of Samuel, of Kings, and of Chronicles; for the history of the captivity and the time which immediately succeeded it, the historical part of Daniel, the books of Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah.

To these sources the whole Jewish synagogue and the Christian church attributed not merely human credibility, but also divine inspiration, the latter on the ground especially of Paul's explicit statement in 2 Tim. iii. 14, etc.; a declaration which certainly does not justify many later exaggerations of the inspiration theory. Thus a greater certainty is in some measure attached to this history than to that which takes place immediately before our eyes. It is unquestionable that as certainly as there is a sacred record, so surely must such a character be postulated *à priori* of its main sources. It would be impossible to commit the account of God's revelations and dealings to purely human activity without placing them in jeopardy, and robbing them of a great part of their edifying significance to the church. But a very different opinion began to assert

itself in the second half of the last century. The idea rapidly gained ground that the history of the Hebrews, like that of other ancient nations, has a mythical character, viz. that it is composed of mingled truth and fiction. Heyne, who gave to the study of Greek mythology in Germany a new impulse and direction, had already hinted at this. By degrees theologians began to transfer their mythical views to the Old Testament. This happened first with reference to the oldest biblical history. Seiler, the former Erlangen historian, in other respects worthy of high honour, and Müntinghe confined the region of myths to Genesis alone. But unfortunately it was not possible to stop there. It soon became obvious that the matter which in Genesis suggested a mythical explanation was also contained in later portions of the history, not only of the Old but also of the New Testament; hence either the whole idea must be given up, or else extended to all the records of revelation. If we allow everything else in Scripture to be historical, the contents of Genesis, in accordance with its essential character, apart from all other confirmation, must be regarded as historical by virtue of the complete harmony existing between the manner of God's revelation contained in it and that which is communicated in all the other books. It is inconceivable that a series of actually historical manifestations of God should be preceded by a number of fictions so exactly similar. This circumstance is destructive of all half-dealing in this department, and is likewise the main cause of the panic which has been excited among theologians by Strauss's *Lives of Jesus*, first and second. Their own conscience told them that whoever says A must say B. They had lulled it to sleep for a time, but now it awoke suddenly. Therefore it was impossible to stop with Genesis. A purely mythical interpretation of Genesis was also of little avail for ever-increasing deism and rationalism. A system which rests upon the exclusion of all immediate action of God upon the world knows nothing of a living God; and cannot apprehend the love which brought Him down from heaven and unites heaven to earth. It does not see the angels who are continually ascending and descending on Jacob's ladder, John i. 51, nor the hand out of the clouds which even now separates the waters of the sea from the world that a free

passage may be granted to the people of God; nor will it be satisfied until the mythical view is brought to bear upon all the Old Testament records, because all are opposed to this view. This advance was actually made before long; among others, by E. Lor. Bauer in his *Handbook of the History of the Hebrew Nation*, Nürnberg 1800–1804; and in his *Hebrew Mythology of the Old and New Testaments*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1802; and by Meyer in his attempt at *A Hermeneutic of the Old Testament*, part ii. p. 543, etc. The object was to show that those various classes of myths which Heyne adopted in Greek mythology were also common to Scripture; viz. the historical myths, based upon events which actually occurred, but have been dressed up and disfigured by tradition; philosophical myths, historical embodiments of a philosophical idea; and poetic myths, historical embodiments of a poetic idea. Meyer, Bauer, and others contented themselves with treating everything which transcends the ordinary course of nature as mythical; what remained they allowed to be historical, and even defended its truth. This mode of procedure could not stand. It must soon become obvious that the principle according to which mythical and historical were distinguished, was a purely dogmatic, pseudo-theological one, and that by allowing the sources of sacred history to be trustworthy in everything which did not transcend the ordinary course of nature, involuntary testimony was borne to that which was rejected as mythical. It was therefore reserved for others to take the next step in advance, especially for De Wette. In his work which appeared in 1807, *Kritik der Israelitischen Geschichte*, and in his *Lehrbuch der Hebr. u. Jüdischen Archäologie*, § 29, he declares the whole ancient history of the Hebrews to be mythical throughout, making the historical soil to begin with Samuel; but at the same time maintains that the Hebrews never succeeded in rising to pure history. According to him, the Pentateuch has the same historical value as Homer; it is the *epos* of Hebrew theocracy, a term which is afterwards repeated by Hupfeld, who generally follows in the footsteps of De Wette. With the history after Samuel, De Wette deals in much the same manner in which Bauer and others have dealt with the earlier, or rather with the whole history. Rarely profound in his researches, he treats as mythical not only everything which is supernatural in this part, but also much which he

cannot at once reconcile to his judgment, whatever gives him the impression of improbability, or whatever in the later history contradicts his presupposition of the purely mythical character of the earliest history, for example, the statement of Chronicles with reference to the validity of the Mosaic law. He handles the New Testament in the same manner in which his predecessors had done. He did not look upon the whole New Testament as mythical, but only as containing myths. Strauss in his *Life of Jesus* holds the same position where the New Testament is concerned with respect to De Wette, which De Wette occupies with regard to his predecessors in reference to the Old Testament, especially those historical books which embrace the oldest time. This view of the most ancient Israelitish historical sources, which originated with De Wette, is now almost universally given up. Ewald, Hitzig, Tuch, Bleek, Bertheau, etc., stand essentially on the standpoint of Bauer, Meyer, and Eichhorn. They emphatically protest against the view which entirely gives up the more ancient Israelitish history. But it cannot be denied that the preference for consistency is due to De Wette, and to those who distinctly attach themselves to him, as v. Bohlen. Where, as in Ewald, important portions of the history are said to be mythical, and a universal traditional element is assumed; there can be no justification of the confidence which seeks to raise up a new building from the ruins. In detail this criticism certainly has the advantage, as in the New Testament the preference must be given to Renan over Strauss, who rests on him in principle. They are not obliged to represent as mythical that which powerfully asserts itself as historical. This mythical mode of treating the Old Testament has not been without vehement opponents. The most important protest against it is contained in monographs on separate contested books, especially the Pentateuch, Chronicles, and Daniel, which have given rise to a most lively dispute. The most distinguished among those who have occupied themselves with the subject generally is J. H. Pareau, *De mythica sacri codicis interpretatione*, 2d edit., Utr. 1824. The author has handled his subject with extensive learning, in lucid order, and in beautiful, though somewhat vague language. Although he is not profound, and is frequently inconsistent and unfaithful to his own principles, yet his work,

which has been almost entirely ignored by rationalistic criticism, is entitled to attentive consideration.

A complete refutation of the more recent view concerning the historical books of the Old Testament belongs to the Introduction to the Old Testament, the germ of which is formed by inquiries into the genuineness, integrity, credibility, and inspiration of the biblical books. Yet it will not be irrelevant if we briefly give a few general arguments against the rationalistic view of the historical books of the Old Testament, and in favour of their credibility.

1. It is unquestionable that those who acknowledge the authority of Christ and the apostles, who therefore do not occupy an exclusively naturalistic standpoint, cannot without the greatest inconsistency entertain this opinion. The whole Jewish canon, as it existed in the time of Christ, is by Him and Paul expressly sanctioned as divine, comp. John v. 39, x. 35, 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16; and all unanimously confess that the collected historical books of the Old Testament belonged to it. Many of the Old Testament events are quoted as decided, indubitable, historical truth, and precisely those which have been most disputed; such as the leading facts in the life of Abraham; the miraculous feeding with manna; the miraculous springing forth of water from the rock; cure by looking at the brazen serpent, John iii. 14; the phenomena which accompanied the giving of the law; and the history of Elijah and Elisha, Luke iv. 25, etc. Even by limiting the freedom from error of our Lord and His apostles to the religious element, we do not bring the modern view of the historical books of the Old Testament into harmony with their authority. For who will maintain that it is the same in a religious point of view whether we regard a pretended revelation as real, or not? Would it be possible for all those events which the historical books of the Old Testament narrate, and which are ratified by the testimony of Christ and the apostles, to stand in direct or indirect relation to religion, and yet for the view of God's personality not to assume quite another aspect if these events be rejected as mythical? Even the defenders of the modern view maintain that it is by no means the same in a religious point of view, and that it is highly prejudicial to religious life and perception to regard the accounts of the historical books concerning the revela-

tions of God under the Old Testament as true. In the alleged interest of religion they dispute the historical character of the historical books, and maintain that it would be derogatory to God to have revealed Himself in the manner therein specified. There are no acts of God which are not at the same time doctrines; all that God does reveals in some degree what He is; and it is therefore just so much religious error to attribute truth to fictitious history, in so far as it has reference to religious history as to give the sanction of its authority to false dogma. But the question here is not merely of isolated references or passing confirmations. Our Lord and His apostles are completely at home on the soil of that history which is said to be mythical. They delight in it, deriving vigour and nourishment from it. We have only to look at the history of the temptation to see how our Lord lived in the history which is declared to be mythical, and drew strength from it in time of trial. So also with regard to the crucifixion. Even in His last words Jesus had the Old Testament before His eyes. This is the more significant, since the Saviour in all that He does prefigures that which we ought to do; for behind His every action admonition lies concealed.

2. In favour of the credibility of the historical books, and in opposition to the mythical view, we may adduce the harmony which exists between this history and that of other nations. For primitive history, indeed, this harmony avails nothing. The most which has been done in this respect proves, on nearer consideration, not to be an independent confirmation of the biblical account, but to have first emanated from it, and to have originated in the time of the Alexandrian syncretism. Scarcely anything remains which we can safely rely on. Even external confirmations of the history of the flood, notwithstanding their number, and the frequency with which we encounter them (comp. for example the compilation in Rosenmüller, viz. *The Old and New East*, vol. i.; and in Andreas Wagner, *The History of the Primitive World*), will not bear a severe critical test, but may collectively be recognised as an echo of the Old Testament narrative. Not one of the heathen traditions respecting the flood seems to have an independent basis. For later times, however, the witness drawn from the harmony of the heathen accounts is conclusive and sufficient. That which is related in

the Pentateuch concerning Egypt not only agrees with the accounts of Herodotus, Diodorus, and other ancient writers, but also receives remarkable confirmation from the recent discoveries made with reference to Egypt. There is no inquirer in the department of Egyptian antiquity of any note who has not by his investigations been filled with reverence for the Pentateuch; none who has even remotely assumed the same position with respect to it as the rationalistic theologians, which is certainly a remarkable witness to the prejudice of the latter. Comp. with Hupfeld on *Genesis*, Champollion's *Letters from Egypt*; Rosellini *On the Monuments of Egypt*, Pisa 1830, 7 vols.; Wilkinson *On the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians after the Monuments*, London 1837, 6 vols.; the collection of smaller books on Egyptian antiquity by Brugsch, which appeared in the year 1864; and my work, *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, Berlin 1841. That which we find concerning Egypt in the later historical books has also received remarkable confirmation from the discovery of the Egyptian monuments. The names of the Egyptian kings mentioned in Scripture have been found on them, such as Shishak and Pharaoh Necho. Shishak, who, according to 1 Kings xiv. 25, 26, made war upon Rehoboam, frequently appears on the Egyptian monuments under the name of Sesonchis. In the first court of the great palace at Karnak is the figure of a king, with the inscription, "The favourite of Amon Sesonchis;" and among the representatives of the nations conquered by him there is one with a beard and a manifestly Jewish physiognomy, bearing the name 'Ιούδα Hamalek or Melk, kingdom of Judah: comp. Rosellini, i. ii. p. 79; Champollion's *Letters*, p. 66. A mine no less rich than that of the Egyptian tombs is now discovered in the ruins of the old Assyrian capital, Nineveh, whose exploration has been prosecuted with great zeal, especially by English scholars.

The thing is still in progress, but already there have been several striking confirmations of the biblical narrative. Compare the compilation in *The Commentary of O. Strauss on Nahum*, Berlin 1853; also, by the same, *Essay on Nineveh*, Berlin 1855. The fragments of Berosus and Abydenos concerning ancient Babylonish history, especially Nebuchadnezzar, as well as the Tyrian journals, have been legitimately employed by Josephus to confirm the biblical relations. The book of

Esther, one of the most disputed with regard to its credibility, has, in consequence of its harmony with the accounts of the most approved ancient writers, been characterized by Heeren as a perfectly reliable authority concerning the internal arrangements of the Persian court; and almost every single statement which it contains may be verified from the scattered accounts of ancient writers on Persia, as Baumgarten has last of all shown with great industry. Where the accounts of foreign writers are at variance with those of the Israelites, it can be proved without difficulty that the preference is on the side of the latter. All modern distinguished historians, as Niebuhr, Schlosser, Heeren, and Leo, agree in this, viz. that the Old Testament history is more authentic even in that which it relates concerning other nations than the most reliable native sources. Compare their statements in the 1st vol. of my contributions to an Introduction to the Pentateuch. If it be proved, therefore, that the historical books have in general a true historical, and not a mythical character, we have no right to reject as mythical that which has reference to an extraordinary interference of God in nature, unless, like the heathen *prodigia*, it stands out aimless and isolated. That it is not so, we hope all the later historical representation will suffice to prove. In the meantime we merely draw attention to the fact that miracle in Scripture goes hand in hand with prophecy, which God can completely control, and in which a power superior to nature is openly manifested.

3. A counter-proof against the mythical view is drawn from the great antiquity of the historical books, or rather of their sources. Our opponents have been so well aware of this, that they have tried all possible means to throw suspicion on the antiquity of the separate books or of their sources, or even to make it appear that a bad use has been made of their sources. Among all other nations the origin of myths belongs, at least in a great measure, to pre-historic times. Among the Hebrews, on the contrary, we find the remarkable phenomenon that they have advanced in undiminished power side by side with contemporaneous history, which would be the less explicable the more moderate, the more free from exaggerations, and the simpler, in short the more objective, the history everywhere appeared. If the Pentateuch be genuine, mythical explanations,

at least where the last four books of it are concerned, are out of the question. Moses was able faithfully to impart what had taken place before his eyes; and that he designed to relate the truth, his whole character as it appears in his works is a guarantee; and even if he had not wished to do so, he must have done it, since he wrote first of all for those who had witnessed all the great events which he communicated, and to them he could not say that they had seen what they had not seen, or heard what they had not heard. Where the occurrences of Genesis are concerned, Moses is certainly not a contemporaneous narrator; but if the truth of that which is told in the last four books stands firm, God would not permit him whom He had made His ambassador to become the author of unavoidable error. To this may be added the fact, that we cannot deny to Moses himself the human capacity to receive accounts from the primitive world faithfully transmitted. Even if we suppose that he made use of no older written documents, which is by no means proved, yet there were many circumstances favourable to the pure reception of oral tradition, *e.g.* the long duration of the life of man, to which Moses himself appeals in reference to the facts of antiquity, Deut. xxxii. 7, etc., so that even tradition concerning events of the greatest antiquity had only to pass through a few generations; and again, the strength of memory peculiar to times when the art of writing was still unknown; but above all, the great significance which the facts narrated in Genesis had for the bearers of tradition. Then we must also notice the absence of those causes which led to the disfigurement of tradition among other nations. Among these polytheism stands first, for the traditions of Genesis were always continued in the races of the worshippers of the true God. We find no traces moreover of that wild fantasy which among the Greeks became the mother of many myths, by the mingling of its products with historical tradition—the Jewish spirit proved itself from the beginning sharp, clear, and disinclined to obscurity; nor was there a philosophical striving to investigate the causes of things, which even in later times is not to be found among the Hebrews, whose wisdom, always of a thoroughly practical nature, was an immediate product of the fear of God, and was designed to awaken it. To this we may add the simplicity of Semitic life and national character, apparent even among the Arabs, whose oldest

historical traditions, as we have them in *The Hamasah*, *The Monumentis vetustioris Arabiæ* by Schultens, *The Monumentis antiquiss. Historiæ Arabum* by Eichhorn, and in Abulfeda's *Historia Anteislamica* edited by Fleischer, are certainly incomplete and defective, in part traditionary, but throughout not mythical, and always with a basis of historical truth. But the great thing is the moral earnestness which everywhere manifests itself as the peculiarity of the *ἐκλογία* among Israel, from which the sacred literature proceeds, and which meets us continually. Mythical tendencies are incompatible with this moral earnestness. The credibility of the accounts in Genesis is also confirmed by the similarity, to which we formerly drew attention, existing between the substance of it and that of later contemporaneous books, or books taken from contemporaneous sources, from the last four books of the Pentateuch to the Gospels, and still further by the inner and inseparable connection between the relations in Genesis and the events of the last four books. This is especially observable in the history under Moses, which takes for granted the truth of the whole history of the patriarchs, and cannot be explained without it. With respect to this connection, Ranke, in particular, has made many striking remarks. The mode of representation is also an argument in favour of the credibility of the narrative. It breathes the spirit of the highest antiquity, differing characteristically from that which was employed by Moses in the description of his time. If, for example, we read the history of the transactions of Abraham with the children of Heth respecting a burial-place in chap. xxiii., we shall find it impossible to divest ourselves of the impression of great antiquity. The same may be said with reference to the account of the march of the kings from Asia to Palestine, in chap. xiv. But the strongest proof of the genuineness of the history is its inner character of truth, its grand simplicity, its worthiness of God, its naturalness, and the striking manner in which it depicts character—everything as it could not be imitated even by the highest art. Nor must we forget to draw attention to the firmness and security with which Genesis ascends to the first beginnings of peoples; for example, in the accounts concerning the Horites, Edomites, Ammonites, and Moabites. That we have not to do with fantasies and floating traditions is obvious from the complete consistency of

the most remotely scattered notices. Besides the last four books of the Pentateuch, the books of Ezra and Nehemiah are contemporaneous ; and most probably, agreeably to arguments drawn from the history of the canon, Esther also. Its statements are certainly taken from a contemporaneous and official source quoted in itself. The remaining books have either been put together from contemporaneous records, or drawn from contemporaneous sources. The former is the case with the book of Joshua. We gather from many passages that its author was an eye-witness of that which he narrates, most unmistakeably from chap. v. 1. The later author of the book in its present form has done little more than put together the separate contemporaneous documents which had till then been disconnected, and were probably composed by Joshua after the example of Moses ; adding a few historical, geographical, and other remarks. Respecting the book of Judges we cannot so certainly prove the prevailing use of contemporaneous records ; and that these were not at the disposal of the author seems probable from the circumstance that the narration is in many parts incomplete, giving only the names of many of the judges ; an argument which, however, on nearer consideration, has no weight, since the fact is explained by the aim and plan of the author, who desired to write not a perfect history, but rather a historical abstract. The theme is, the people of God may at all times learn from the history of the time of the judges that sin is destruction. For such a deduction, short and slightly mentioned facts afford little interest. That the author knew far more than he told, that he might have availed himself of the whole fulness of facts which occurred in the time of the judges, appears from the appendices, in which, by way of example, he expressly imparts some facts concerning that period which in the book itself is treated only summarily and from a single point of view ; and there can be no doubt that these appendices belong to the beginning of the time of the judges. Such special knowledge with reference to a time already some centuries past could only have been possessed by the author on the supposition that he made use of contemporaneous records. He narrates so naturally, and at the same time so graphically, carries us back so vividly to the period whose history he describes, is so free from anachronisms, and

has so little which transcends the ordinary course of nature, that even our opponents, from Eichhorn to Studer and Bertheau, cannot help conceding a high degree of credibility to his narrative. The author of the books of Samuel does not indeed expressly quote his sources, but we may infer that they were contemporaneous from the fact that Chronicles cite as their source for this period a historical work begun by Samuel, and continued by the prophets Gad and Nathan. That the author of the books of Samuel made the same contemporaneous source the basis of his work, follows from the almost verbal agreement between the sections which both writers have in common. In the books of Kings, the annals of the kings of Judah and the annals of the kings of Israel are generally quoted at the end of each reign, as the sources employed. We gain nearer information concerning the nature of this source from the books of Chronicles. It is always quoted there, but together with it special sources, descriptions of the lives of the separate kings, written by contemporaneous prophets. That these must stand in some relation to the annals of Judah and Israel, the common source, follows from the fact that the books of Chronicles are in the closest verbal agreement with the books of Kings, where they quote these special sources. In reference to two of the adduced special sources we have also the express statement of the Chronicles that they were incorporated in the annals of the kingdom, 2 Chron. xx. 34, xxxii. 32. Thus the credibility of the historical books is supported throughout by the fact of their antiquity. Accordingly the writers of the books of Kings and Chronicles must generally have made use of contemporaneous sources. Their credibility is therefore open to suspicion only on the assumption that they have used their sources unfaithfully; but the contrary may be proved not only from the character which they manifest, and which secures them against all suspicion of intentional falsification, but also from the bearing of the parallel relations in the books of Samuel and of Kings on the one hand, and in the books of Chronicles on the other, as well as of the historical passages of Isaiah and Jeremiah to the parallels in the books of Kings. The almost verbal agreement which here exists shows that they do not, in accordance with the general custom of Oriental historians, work over their sources, but take from

them almost verbal extracts of that which is suitable for their purpose.

4. The credibility of the historical books of the Old Testament follows from their close agreement with the historical accounts and references in the Psalms and Prophets. In numerous passages we find the more ancient history of the people with all its marvels described exactly as related in the older historical books, and thus raised above all doubt. (Comp. for example the long Psalm lxxviii., which was sung as early as David's time, and which gives the nation, as a warning, a survey of its whole history, beginning with the time of Moses.) Where matters of fact are concerned, it exactly agrees with the Pentateuch, even to the smallest details. If we compare also the historical Psalms cv. and cvi., composed in the time of the captivity, with Psalm lxxviii. and with the historical books, we cannot fail to be convinced of the narrow bounds within which poetry is here confined: its scope is throughout limited to the sphere of the formal. (Comp. with the narrative in the book of Judges the references to the facts there detailed made in Josh. ix. 4, x. 26; Hab. iii. 7.) The traditions of profane history, on the other hand, have a highly uncertain character; in them we find no evidence of that firm state of national consciousness characteristic of later times; their poetic character has passed into oblivion, and not two among late writers of any note substantially agree concerning them. A national consciousness so steady throughout is quite unexampled with respect to fictitious events, myths. The historical references of the Psalmist and the Prophets to the peculiar relations of their time always exactly coincide with that which the historical books narrate—the respective accounts mutually explain and confirm one another, as Moses has proved with regard to Chronicles, and as I have endeavoured to show in my *Commentary on the Psalms*. To adduce only one very striking example: Every feature of the graphically told narrative in 2 Chron. xx. of the campaign of Jehoshaphat against the allied Ammonites, Moabites, and Arabs, receives confirmation from the three Psalms which have reference to these events—Psalms xlvi., xlvii., lxxxi.

5. The truth of the historical narrative as a whole is ratified by the remarkable agreement and connection of the occurrences

which are related in it, as must in some measure be perceived even by the unenlightened mind. The historian Woltmann says: "The history of the Old Testament has a truly iron connection, by virtue of the unchangeable manner of revelation, which constantly continues alike, and the historical personality of God;—by the absence of that love of the marvellous which leads to the fabrication of miracles, exemplified by the fact that wonders are related only where some object worthy of God can be pointed out, where manifestly a grand crisis takes place, where the question relates to the existence or non-existence of the kingdom of God—as in Egypt, in the time of Elijah, and during the captivity;—and by the circumstance that in many periods where no such phenomena are recorded, the narrative adheres to the ordinary course of nature; as, for example, in the period from the death of Joseph to the appearance of Moses; throughout nearly the whole time of the Judges; in the time of David and Solomon; and in the period succeeding the Babylonish captivity, the history of which is recorded in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah;—and finally, by the fact that, even in the relation of wonderful events, as, for instance, the Egyptian plagues, the passage through the Red Sea, the feeding with manna and quails, etc., there is no concealment of those natural causes whose efficacy was merely intensified by God, or directed in a peculiar manner, so that the supernatural, as it is most clearly set forth in the plagues of Egypt, rests almost throughout upon naturalistic ground, while a mythical representation either ignores this connection, or wilfully destroys it." To this we may add, that an interest can nowhere be discovered in behalf of which fiction has been carried on for more than a thousand years. Glorification of God, and that of the holy God who is an enemy to every lie and scorns fictitious praise, is the highest and only aim of all the historical books of the Old Testament. Among all other nations history has never been emancipated from the service of a false patriotism. They betray a universal tendency to glorify their founders and greatest men, even at the cost of truth; but in the Old Testament it is otherwise. The ancestors of the Israelitish people do not appear, like those of other nations, as deified heroes, but as simple men, with limited power. Their faults and errors,—as, for example, Abraham's weakness in Egypt, Isaac's similar

weakness, Jacob's deceit, which was punished by a long series of painful, divine chastisements, the atrocity of Jacob's sons at Shechem, Reuben's incest, the crime of Joseph's brethren, etc.,—are related with the same ingenuousness as their excellences and their great deeds, upon which no emphasis is laid. Even with regard to Moses we find no trace of mythical glorification. Everywhere he appears only as a weak human instrument of God: we find the carnal zeal set forth without reserve, which led him to slay the Egyptian; his original striving against the divine call; his sinful indulgence with relation to his wife, from love to whom he omitted to circumcise his son, a breach of duty which was heavily punished by God; and the weakness of faith on account of which he was excluded from the land of promise. In the same unprejudiced way the faults and errors of later men, the most famous of the nation—of a Samson, David, and Solomon—are related. But the historical books betray even less tendency to the direct glorification of the people than to their indirect glorification by magnifying their important men. From the exodus out of Egypt to the leading away into the Babylonish captivity they are always represented as stiffnecked, unbelieving, ungrateful, even after visible proofs of the divine grace; and are always addicted to the grossest idolatry. Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii. 29, xxxii. are a sufficient preservative against the assumption of such tendency: even single verses might suffice; for example, Deut. ix. 24, "Ye have been rebellious against the Lord from the day that I knew you;" xxxi. 27, "For I know thy rebellion and thy stiff neck: behold, while I am yet alive with you this day, ye have been rebellious against the Lord; and how much more after my death?" The author of the book of Judges, in the introduction, in chap. ii. 11, etc., lays down his theme, which he afterwards carries into detail, thus: "And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim; and they forsook the Lord God of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt, and followed other gods, and provoked the Lord to anger. And the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and He delivered them into the hands of spoilers," etc. The author of Psalm cvi. points out in ver. 6 the lesson to be drawn from the whole history of the past: "We have sinned with our fathers, we have committed iniquity, we have done wickedness;" and

then proceeds to particularize the various sins of the nation. Israel became a proverb among the nations on the ground of their historical books: the strict and impartial criticism which is there brought to bear upon Israel has made the history of this people a mirror, in which every one who has any knowledge of himself and of human nature may perceive his own image and that of the human race in sharp and correct outline. Neither do we find a tendency to exalt and magnify any particular station. Many former opponents of revelation have asserted this to be the case with regard to the priestly office; and to this party Leo joined himself in the outset of his career, in his *Lectures on Jewish History*, Berlin 1828, which he afterwards himself recanted in his *History of the World*, vol. i.; while von Bohlen and others again took up what he had let fall, *meliora edoctus*. They maintain that Jewish history was designedly misrepresented by the priests, in the interest of the hierarchy. As in the middle ages men sought by all manner of deceit to sanction the abuses of the Papacy; appealing to an older warrant, for example the Pseudoisidorian Decretals; so the Jewish priests sought to justify all their claims and abuses by interpolating in the Pentateuch laws respecting them which they had forged. In the remaining books also the hierarchy tries to assert itself by every kind of fabrication. But it is scarcely conceivable how even the most prejudiced should be so completely blinded, should go so directly counter to the most palpable facts. How very differently must the Pentateuch have been constituted if it were to correspond to this hypothesis! The ancestor of the Levites had an equal share with the other brethren in the crime against Joseph, the only one of Jacob's sons who has been magnified; in Gen. xlix., in the blessing of the dying Jacob, the outrage which Levi perpetrated on the Shechemites is rebuked in the hardest terms, without a word of mitigation or fatherly affection; and as a punishment, it is declared that his descendants will be scattered throughout all Israel. We find a counterpart to this in the openness with which Exodus and Numbers condemn the sins of the first high priest, Aaron—his sinful compliance with the worship of the calf, the jealousy which prompted him to exalt himself in opposition to Moses, Num. xii., and his weakness of faith in the last year of the wanderings, which was the cause

of his exclusion from the promised land. So in Lev. x. the sin of the two sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and the divine judgment which befell them in consequence, are recorded as an emphatic warning to the priesthood of all ages. In the revolt of the people, Num. xvi., Korah the Levite was the chief ringleader. It is true that in the Mosaic legislation there are rights and revenues granted to the priests; but the former are circumscribed in many ways. With the civil power, over which the priests had immense influence among other eastern nations—among the Egyptians, from whose midst the Israelites had been taken, it was almost entirely under their control—the Hebrew priests had nothing whatever to do. The confounding of theocracy and hierarchy, of which those opponents of the Old Testament are guilty, shows how the Old Testament must have been conditioned if their hypothesis were correct: in every respect the Mosaic state was entirely independent of the priesthood. Only in the administration of justice the priests had a certain share; and this was merely in the capacity of intelligent men, as expounders of the Mosaic law-book, which, according to Deut. xvii. and xxxi., was entrusted to the civil no less than to the spiritual rulers, so that the latter stood under constant control; while among the Egyptians, on the other hand, the civil power was under the guardianship of the priests, and must accept as a divine command whatever the priests represented as such. In a religious point of view also the Levites and priests were placed side by side with the prophets, whose rights were secured by a special law. The revenues of the Levites were certainly not unimportant; but at the same time it must be remembered that they were without landed property, that the remaining tribes were therefore bound to compensate them for their legitimate share in the land of Canaan, and that they owed their revenues to the goodwill of the people, depending on their pious disposition, which Moses had distinctly foretold would in a great measure, and through long periods, have no existence whatever. And this was really the case; for, except perhaps in the time of David and Solomon, the tribe of Levi was generally much worse provided for than any of the remaining tribes; especially after the separation of the kingdom, when the revenue of the ten tribes was completely and for ever lost to it. But above all we must

recollect that the whole character of the Old Testament religion necessarily demanded a suitable maintenance for its servants; and again, that the whole impulse had gone out from those who, in doing homage to the common principle of utilitarianism, failed to appreciate the importance of an office which was designed for the preservation of the higher interests. It is a remarkable testimony to the absence of all evil priestly influence, that this office, so long as it fulfilled its destination, was honoured and wealthy, in accordance with the principle which even the New Testament lays down in this respect, 1 Cor. ix. 11, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" But as soon as it degenerated it became poor and despised, subject to the curse pronounced upon its ancestor, which was effected in this way;—the law made the position of the Levites quite dependent on the goodwill of the people, which rested upon their piety, and this again was dependent on the piety of the Levites. No dotation in landed property, as among the Egyptians, no guarantee of an income by the state. We may confidently ask the rationalism which raised this objection, whether under similar conditions it would be inclined to undertake service in the church. American voluntarism is in some measure prefigured in the position of the Levites. With regard to the remaining books the assertion proves itself even more absurd, for this reason, that either their authors, or the authors of their sources, were not priests, but prophets. This was the case with the books of Chronicles, which with that of Ezra are the only ones composed by priests. And, moreover, they give no prominence to the priestly office; nothing great or glorious was accomplished by it; its efficacy was throughout quiet and unobtrusive; it was limited to the service of the sanctuary and the religious instruction of the people. Nothing is there represented as an encroachment on their rights except that which was really so, as the incense-offering of Uzziah. In whole periods, as, for example, in the time of the judges, there is no mention of the priests; nor is any word of censure passed on Samuel, who, though not a priest, exercised priestly functions. Priestly jealousy would not have been so freely related, nor should we have been told how, at the bringing in of the ark of the covenant, David, at the conclusion of the whole cere-

mony, blessed the people; which appears to have been contrary to the letter of the law, if indeed it were not at direct variance with the spirit of it, as the narrative of Melchizedek and others seems to show. Some have sought to escape from this difficulty by associating the prophethood with the priesthood. But in order to be convinced of the worthlessness of this theory, it is only necessary to look through the prophecies of Jeremiah. Even in the time of Malachi, when the priesthood gave far less offence, at least externally, than formerly, the priestly office forms the principal object of the denunciation of the prophets. Isaiah, in chap. xliii. 27, strikes a blow at the vanity of Israel respecting their own merit, in the words, "Thy first father (the high priest) hath sinned, and thy teachers have transgressed against me." And since the assumption of a tendency to glorify the royal power would be just as reprehensible as the assumption of a tendency to magnify the priesthood, the prophetic office alone remains. But even in this assumption we become involved in insuperable difficulties. The prophets formed no close corporation, not at least in the kingdom of Judah, which is the only question now at issue. It was somewhat different in the kingdom of Israel, where there was certainly some kind of membership and organization; for in it prophets alone performed the service of the true God, after the abolition of the Levitical priesthood. In the kingdom of Judah, where they had only to wall up the gaps, the prophets appeared singly, as they were inspired by the Spirit of God. It is therefore not conceivable that through centuries they should have followed a common plan, and carried on an artful system of deception. And again, in the history before Samuel, the prophets stand far in the background, and prophethood meets us only in isolated, spasmodic phenomena. If the history of the Israelites had been dominated by a prophetic interest, this interest must also have taken possession of earlier times, and must have exercised a powerful influence on the description of the founding of the state. In the time of the kings also there are long periods in which we find no trace whatever of a decided importance of the priesthood. In the kingdom of Judah it properly began to acquire such an importance in the time of Uzziah, when the corruption of the people increased more and more, and the great judgments of the Lord took

their course. Consider also the whole character of the prophets as it appears in the history. Nowhere do they seek their own interest; they wish to be nothing more than instruments of God; they follow no selfish aims; even the greatest prejudice can only regard them as enthusiasts (as such they were esteemed by the godless in Israel, comp. 2 Kings ix. 11), but not as deceivers. The essence of prophetism is briefly and well characterized in Micah, chap. iii. 8: "But truly I am full of power by the Spirit of the Lord, and of judgment, and of might, to declare unto Jacob his transgressions, and to Israel his sin." Thus we find no trace of a carnal interest of any kind; and the reason why we can never unconditionally trust the native sources of the history of all other nations of antiquity is because their interest is everywhere observable. In this department the saying holds good, "If the design be marked, mistake is impossible."

6. Those facts, which are undeniably true, are inexplicable if the narrative of the historical books as a whole be not true, especially in those points which have been most disputed. How, for instance, can it be explained, apart from this assumption, that the Hebrew is the only one among the nations of antiquity which was in some respects far more developed; in which we find, not perhaps abstract monotheism, but at least a reference of the whole life to the one, true, and only living God, a profound moral influence produced by such doctrine, a living faith, with its indispensable basis, a profound conviction of sin—in short, the only people in whose hearts God found a place? How can we explain the phenomenon that among the Hebrews we find religious characters such as Abraham, Moses, David, the invention of which would presuppose a depth of inner experience and of spiritual life such as have been found in no heathen? Or how can we explain the fact that the eyes of this people alone were directed forwards, while the eyes of all other nations were turned backwards in disconsolate longing for what was irrecoverably lost; and that this very people, and none other, should from their first origin (Gen. xii. 3) have cherished the firm conviction through all centuries, that from their midst salvation would spread over all the earth; and that this conviction should have been justified by the result? To these, and a multitude of similar questions,

history, as we have it in the historical books, affords a most satisfactory answer; while, on the other hand, those modern writers who reject this history have no resource but to explain them away. At the time when the Hegelian school was predominant, every exertion was made to furnish the desired explanation of facts from purely human causes: by the most powerful critical operations the lowest was put uppermost in order to produce the appearance of a steady, natural development. This is the course recently pursued by Planck, *The Genesis of Judaism*, Ulm 1843. But even with the help of such procedure, which is altogether arbitrary, being now directed by the re-awakened non-historical sense, no step in advance has been gained towards the main question. Even if we place at the close of the history of the Israelites that which meets us at the beginning, we still find nothing similar in any nation of the earth; not one has in the course of natural development attained to such religious advancement. The main question has reference not to the time when such a thing occurred, but to the fact that it did occur; and to answer this question we are and remain incapable.

The weight of the arguments adduced is very much strengthened if we look at the weakness of those which our opponents have advanced in favour of the mythical character of the historical books. The main argument, drawn from the impossibility of miracles, is purely dogmatic, and therefore need not be considered here. Where there is living faith in God the worthlessness of this argument is at once perceived. The assumption of the aimlessness of miracles must be surrendered when we see how long the nation was spiritually sustained by the great deeds of the Lord in Egypt; how through centuries, in every time of their need, when they were as the rose among thorns, the small flock in the midst of wolves, it was by virtue of those great deeds that they reached a living faith in their God. Amyraldus on Psalm cvi. says, 'Haud fere minus est frequens in V. T. liberationis ex Ægypto et transitus maris rubri mentio, quam in novo redemptionis cujus Christus nobis auctor est.' In like manner it may be shown, that to assume the representation of our historical books to be not of a purely historic nature, because what they narrate as history cannot be constructed, or explained by the natural sequence of cause and effect, is purely dogmatic, being based on the Pantheistic

or Atheistic exclusion of all supernatural causality, and has therefore no significance whatever to any one who does not occupy this standpoint. It belongs to the very essence of a revelation not to allow of construction. Add to this, what we have already indicated, that the originators of this assumption prove themselves incompetent to furnish the natural explanation of assured historical facts which is demanded. Another argument is taken from the analogy subsisting among all other nations, where the beginnings of history are universally mythical. Why should the Hebrews alone form an exception, particularly as so many narratives of the historical books present such striking relationship to the myths of the heathen—for example, the cosmogonies, the theophanies, etc.? But the analogy of other nations can prove little in itself. Even among them there is a great difference with respect to the mythical character of primitive history. Among the Arabs, for example, as already noticed, we find scarcely any evidence of such a mythical character; although their tradition must have been orally transmitted for many centuries; for the introduction of the art of writing does not date far beyond the time of Mohammed. The tradition of the Mexicans is also, comparatively speaking, very simple; and even the earlier history of the Romans has a far less mythical character comparatively than that of the Greeks, even if we allow the results at which Niebuhr arrives in his works to be established—results pointing rather to a traditional than to a mythical character of this history. If even among heathen nations we find so great a difference in this respect, how much less should we expect a mythical character to belong to the history of a people among whom we find none of the causes which in other nations called forth their differences in a smaller or greater degree, of which the deification of nature and of men was perhaps the most influential; among whom the knowledge and exclusive worship of the one true God were preserved in their purity by special divine arrangements; in whom we find everywhere, instead of the misty heathen confusion, the sharpest and clearest separation, definite distinctions, limitations, the absolute antithesis of God and man, the angels separated by exact boundary-lines from God on the one side, and on the other from men. The conclusion leading to like effects is rational only where like causes can

be pointed out. Where these are wanting, we must not *à priori* expect similarity, but dissimilarity of results. If we concede that the Hebrew nation, in respect of its religious consciousness, forms an exception to all other nations of antiquity; it becomes highly irrational, from the analogy of myths—the production of heathen, religious consciousness—to conclude without further consideration that the Israelites must have had myths; just as irrational as if we were to conclude, from the sinfulness of all men, that Christ also was infected with sin. The analogy of other nations would only apply to the mythical character belonging to the narrative of the very earliest times. For among others, especially the Greeks, the mythical character of history ceases as soon as historiography begins. Among the Hebrews, on the contrary, the alleged mythical character was much stronger in later times, long after history had begun to be written down, than it had been at an earlier period. The history of Elijah and Elisha, for example, and even the events narrated in the Gospels, contain far more which transcends the ordinary course of nature than the record of the first chapter of Genesis. Hence the analogy tells far more against than for the mythical character of the historical books. For if on its account we must regard the later history as purely historical, then we may justly draw an inference respecting the earlier history; for, as we remarked before, they must stand or fall together, on account of their great similarity of character, and the close connection which existed between them, and cannot possibly be separated. But in reference to the argument taken from the relation of Old Testament history to the myths of other nations we may observe, that this relation exists only in a limited measure, and in conjunction with infinitely greater diversity. Moreover, the myths of these nations are generally a consequence of sin, and tend to promote it; their marvels have no object, unless it be to deceive; and we find a multitude of gods interfering in the affairs of men, more powerful and wiser, but not better than they; and withal at variance among themselves: in Old Testament history everything is in direct or indirect relation to religion and morality, to the establishment, confirmation, and spread of the worship of the true God; every miracle has an obvious connection with exalted divine institu-

tions of salvation, nor do we find any employment of unholy means for a holy end; we have the simple antithesis between an almighty, holy, merciful God and weak, sinful man, angels only mediating between both, mere instruments and servants of God. In ancient heathendom we see the self-interested attempt of every nation to glorify itself, to place its origin in the most remote antiquity, and by mingling the divine and human to derive it from the gods: in the Old Testament there is none of this self-seeking; the whole duration of the earth in its present form is fixed within comparatively narrow limits, in harmony with the results of sound natural philosophy; we are told how a multitude of nations were already in existence when the ancestor of the Hebrews was still unborn; nor is there any concealment of the fact that he was a weak man, a mere shepherd-prince, who could not call a foot-breadth of land his own. Among the heathen there is an unmistakeable, historical envelope of physical speculations and poetic views; it is obvious at every step that we are in the region of personification, where the fact is but a light and transparent veil, the thought which it conceals misty and floating: in the Old Testament, on the contrary, there is no trace of philosophizing concerning the reasons of things and the forces of nature; the historical representation is indeed adapted to the spirit of the age, it is living and vivid, but at the same time extremely simple, and strictly separated from the poetic element, everything being clear and defined. When a relationship actually does exist, we must first of all inquire whether it has an independent character or not. This is least of all the case with respect to those very cosmogonies to which reference is most frequently made, for these, in so far as they strikingly agree with the cosmogonies of the Israelites, are an emanation from them, and belong to a very late period, that of syncretion—this is especially the case with the cosmogony of the pretended Sanchoniathon, of Berosus, etc. The same may be said also of the heathen traditions of the flood. But when the relationship shows itself to be independent, it proves far more in favour of the historic truth of the historical books of the Old Testament. Thus the universality of feigned theophanies among the nations of antiquity points to the fact that there is an indelible longing inherent

in man for the nearer union of heaven and earth ; and since this longing is innate, it must somewhere find a satisfaction which is not merely imaginary but real. We may, therefore, look upon feigned theophanies as a prophecy of real theophanies, and by virtue of their aim, a prophecy of the incarnation of God in Christ. We might even venture to say that there can be no real theophanies when there are no fictitious ones ; for if such were the case, that necessity for a general revelation, and especially for a revelation in this form, would be wanting, which forms the basis of its reality. Thus the pretended prophecies among the heathen point to an actual satisfying of the demand which gave rise to them in connection with religion. In this case the Old Testament explains itself even with regard to the relation between what existed among Israel and the apparently similar among the heathen ; an explanation which is available for everything of the same nature. In Deut. xviii. all fortune-telling and necromancy are most strictly forbidden. But this mere negative command would have made no impression. Therefore a promise is superadded : the Lord gives to Israel that which they may not seek elsewhere, and cannot find. He will raise up prophets to them ; them shall they hear. Thus with regard to the history of the fall, the myths of other nations of antiquity show this much at least, that it is inscribed on the human heart in indelible characters ; that the condition of man and of the earth, as we find it, cannot have been the original one, so that on this ground it is certain an occurrence of the kind related in Genesis must have taken place ; and we may also observe that those elements in heathen tradition which incidentally agree are also transferred from the Old Testament ; a fact attested by the age to which the writings belong that contain harmonious features. If, therefore, the monstrous exaggerations of other nations respecting the great age of the first men confirm the corresponding statements of Genesis, we may assume either that an obscure knowledge of this historical fact had been transmitted to the nations by tradition ; or else that the legend was only the individual expression of a universal consciousness, viz. that the human race, alienated from God, is continually subject to increasing deterioration ; which latter assumption is the more proba-

ble, since fragments of tradition from the primitive world, having their origin among the heathen, can never be certainly discriminated; the fact seems rather to have been that a fantastic impulse had completely obliterated the historical remembrance of the most ancient times at the period when men attained to a clear consciousness, and historiography was developed among them. But the deepest reason of the agreement between heathen myth and Israelitish history may be found in the fact that mythus and sacred history have to some extent a similar foundation, viz. idea, which mythus clothes in historic garb, while in sacred history it is actually historical. This is the truth underlying the mythical view; and he who is not able to recognise it, or grant it the importance which it deserves, who has not accurately and profoundly grasped the distinction between myth and fable on the one side, and between sacred and profane history on the other, will be incompetent to the task of refuting it. The distinction does not indeed lie in the mere fact of being historical, but chiefly in the idea itself, which was only dimly apprehended in heathenism, and presents itself there in the degenerate form of the carnal and natural. Another argument for the mythical character of the historical books is taken from the rudeness of early times, which does not justify us in expecting *à priori* an historical perception, from the sensuousness of their manner of thought and expression, and from their ignorance of natural causes, which is said to have derived immediately from God much which could have been explained on natural grounds. As to the former, viz. the assumption of a development of man from the condition of animals, from animal barbarism, everything is against it,—not only the testimony of the Old and New Testaments, but also the wisdom and goodness of the Creator, who must have provided better for His noblest creature; and again, a series of experiences which show that individual men who through special circumstances sank into animal barbarism, never attained to a rational state, or to the use of language, except by the advice and instruction of others; that savage nations have never of themselves risen to a state of civilisation, but in every case only by intercourse with cultivated nations; and, finally, the impossibility among the most ancient nations, as, for example, the Egyptians, of proving the

steps of such a development; as also the concurrent tradition of the most diverse nations, according to which the oldest races of men enjoyed special gifts and a union with God particularly close, a tradition whose significance is not lost, but rather enhanced if we attribute to it a theological value only, not a historical one. That the higher condition was antecedent to the lower, and that barbarism was only deterioration, is partly conceded, even by those who by no means stand on the ground of faith in a revelation. A. W. von Schlegel, in his preface to the German translation of Prichard's *Sketch of Egyptian Mythology*, Bonn 1837, p. 16, speaks thus: "The more I look into the ancient history of the world, the more I am convinced that civilised nations have deteriorated from a purer worship of the Supreme God; that the magical power of nature over the imagination of the race of men then in existence, afterwards gave rise to polytheism, and, finally, quite obscured spiritual conceptions in the popular faith." Schelling in his *Lectures on the Method of Academic Study*, which appeared in 1803, says, "There is no condition of barbarism which is not the product of a degraded civilisation. It is reserved for the future labours of the history of the earth to show how even those nations, living in a state of barbarism, have only been separated from the rest of the world by means of revolutions, and are in some measure severed nationalities which, being deprived of intercourse and of the means of culture they had already acquired, have fallen back into their present condition." Sensusness of conception and representation cannot be regarded as necessarily conditioning the mythical character of a narration; it acts prejudicially only when a falling away from the truth has already preceded it. When this is not the case the form alone is affected, leaving the essence untouched. Otherwise children could not speak the truth. Moreover, the sharp intelligence which characterizes the Jewish nation may be seen in germ even in the first beginnings of Israel. Finally, the assertion that much in the Old Testament is referred immediately to God, to the exclusion of secondary causes, is without foundation. Every attempt which has hitherto been made to explain by purely natural causes, what the Scriptures represent as really miraculous, as, for example, the plagues in Egypt, has been unsuccessful, even though it should be capable of easy proof that in

many cases, indeed almost universally, God only permitted causes already existing in the ordinary course of nature to come into operation at an unusual time, in unusual succession, and to work in a strengthened and intensified degree; which is just what forms the characteristic distinction between true and false miracles, and stamps the wonders of revelation with the seal of credibility. It is certain that we find a religious mode of thought prevailing even with respect to natural things, when we are told, for example, that God thunders, He feeds the birds, He clothes the lilies. But, at the same time, there is no denial of the fact that God works by natural causes. The examples which are generally represented as containing a false reference of the natural to God, prove on nearer examination to be far from pertinent. When, for example, Bezaleel had by human means acquired considerable skill in the school of the Egyptians, is this circumstance incompatible with the fact that God elevated and sanctified his talent and skill for the good of the church? Experience, reaching even to modern times, teaches that an art which truly serves the church of God cannot be acquired without His help. A spiritual taste can only be learnt in the sanctuary of God. And if under the New Testament every *χάρισμα* has its natural ground, on which it proves itself efficacious, can we maintain, in direct opposition to Scripture, that the *χαρίσματα* themselves are natural? It is usual to appeal to the hardening of Pharaoh. But here Scripture is in harmony throughout with the results of a sound empiricism, which teaches that sin indeed everywhere belongs to man, but the form in which it finds expression (and in the case of Pharaoh the question turns on this alone) belongs to God, who invariably controls the circumstances under which the germs of sin in man develop themselves. And we have already observed how carefully, even in the relation of marvels, those natural causes are adduced which God employed in their performance. The more the sacred writers lived in view of the divine necessity of the ordinary course of nature, the less they felt themselves tempted to destroy or even to conceal the necessary sequence of things, the close connection of the marvellous and the natural,—the less they felt themselves disposed to invent miracles, which to them were not an object of wonder. A love of the marvellous

belongs only to godlessness ; so that the assumption that God performs miracles presupposes godlessness. Hence even those who are deceived respecting the condition of human nature must regard miracles as aimless. Finally, our opponents urge that for the honour of holy Scripture, and out of regard for religion, it is incumbent on us to preserve the mythical interpretation. But we need not enter more closely into this argument. It is probably only a jest ; an attempt to throw dust in the eyes of the simple. Even De Wette, who has carried the mythical view to its utmost extent, gives expression to a very different sentiment. In his *Kritik on the History of the Israelites*, p. 408, he says : "Happy were our ancestors who, in ignorance of the art of criticism, themselves truly and honestly believed all they taught. History lost at least in this respect, that she faithfully related myths which she was obliged always to continue to relate as truth, even while, from love to the doubter, adding the warning that they were myths ; but religion gained. I have not been the first to commence criticism ; but since the dangerous game has been once begun, it must be carried through, for only that which is perfect of its kind is good. The genius of humanity watches over the race, and will not suffer it to be robbed of the noblest which exists for men." These latter words have verified themselves in a remarkable manner. At the time when they were spoken sacred history as such had been already borne to the grave. Now it has risen again with the church.

But it is time we should pass on to the other native sources of the history of the Old Testament. Among these the remaining books of the Old Testament take the second position. From these we obtain not merely isolated historic notices, such as we find especially in the Psalms and the writings of the prophets ; they often afford us the most vivid picture of the times in which they were written. We learn more of the condition of religion and morality in many periods from the predictions of the prophets, than from the notices of the historical books, which in some cases are but brief, and in which great care must be taken to keep the prophetic standpoint continually in mind. Nor must it be forgotten that the prophets lived in view of the infinitely high destination of the covenant people, applied to the actual the strict measure of the ideal, and unsparingly

condemned that which was not conformable to it; turning their attention as preachers of repentance to offences rather than to existing good. We have an excellent supplement to their representations, which are in some measure one-sided, in the Psalms, which clearly lay before us the heart of the *ἐκλογία* in Israel. If we had not the Psalms, we should be tempted to put a much lower value on the results of true religion than they really deserve, particularly as most of the historical books were written by prophets, and from a prophetic standpoint. The Psalms afford us the deepest insight into the inner life of the most noble among the nation, more especially as the only one who specially speaks in them repeatedly declares himself to be an organ of the whole community to which he belongs, of the just, the God-fearing,—many of whom awaken in us a vivid idea of religious collective life under the Old Testament. Thus, for example, the so-called Psalms of Degrees, or more correctly Pilgrim-Songs, intended to be sung by festive processions on the pilgrimage to Jerusalem (Ps. cxx.—cxxxiv.). And we must attach the greater significance to the Psalms, because they accompany us through the whole history of Israel, from the time of David through whom this great gift was first imparted in full measure to the people of God, after they had already had a foretaste of it by Moses (Ps. xc.), till after the return from exile. Throughout this long period there is no great event of which the Psalms do not treat; no great trouble or joy which does not there find expression. In this connection we encounter two principal groups, the Psalms of the Davidic time, and those which belong to the period of the captivity,—the latter partly in anticipation of misery preparing a treasure of comfort and hope, as Ps. xci.—c., partly in the midst of it, mourning and despairing, and rising to resignation and confidence, as for example Ps. civ.—cvi.; partly giving thanks after the deliverance, and praying for a continuation of the work begun, as in Ps. cvii.—cl., with the exception of the interpolated Psalms of David. Between these two groups are the Psalms which celebrate the great deliverance of the Lord under Jehoshaphat, Ps. xlvi., xlvii., lxxxiii., and those which have reference to the oppression and deliverance under Hezekiah, Ps. xlviii., lxxv., lxxvi. As to the authorship of the Psalms, they belong partly to David, partly to the Schools of

Singers which arose under his influence, to the Asaphites and the Sons of Korah; and partly to unknown authors, which is especially the case with regard to those which were composed after the return from captivity. The Psalms and the writings of the prophets are especially instructive in reference to the contrast between the true and false Israel, between the just and the wicked, believers and unbelievers; the latter being again divided into those who utterly despise the kingdom of God, and those whose unbelief is based on self-righteousness, a division afterwards verified in the sects of the Pharisees and Sadducees. This constantly recurring antithesis—in order fully to appreciate it we must compare Ps. xxii. and Isa. lxx.—points to a later separation, under the New Testament, of those heterogeneous elements which had formerly been united in the external theocracy; and as a preparation for the church of the New Testament, of which it contains a prediction, must be kept constantly in view. A new, holy, and pure church of the Lord is frequently foretold by the prophets, comp. for example Isa. iv. 3, 4. The non-historical writings have also special importance with regard to the further development of the doctrinal system, which in the history of the Old Testament, so far as it aims at being a history of divine revelations, must necessarily be considered with care. Legislation ended with the Pentateuch, *i.e.* religious legislation; for the purely civil maintains its ordinary course. The civil rulers of after-time were not at all limited to it; but the Pentateuch has to do with it for all ages, only in so far as it rests immediately upon a religious and ethical foundation. It is not so with doctrine; respecting this, God by His instruments gave to later times, *viz.* those previous to the Babylonish captivity, disclosures for which earlier times were not yet ripe. These disclosures were most important when they had reference to the doctrine of the Messiah, a doctrine which even in the Psalms had made considerable advance, owing to the union of the promise made to David of eternal kingship in his family, 2 Sam. vii., with the already existing Messianic hopes; and which was afterwards developed on every side by the prophets; but even with respect to other doctrines, *viz.* of the resurrection, of the angels, and of Satan, there is an important advance on what exists in the

Pentateuch only in germ, but is nevertheless constantly present; everything later is only further development and advance.

The third native source is formed by the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. Of these the books of the Maccabees alone are historical; for wherever else we find historical form it is merely envelope. This is the case with Tobit and Judith, whose historical character Wolf, a Silesian superintendent, has recently undertaken to defend—an attempt truly absurd; so also with the book of Baruch, in which an Israelite in the *διασπορά* puts his own sentiments in the mouth of Jeremiah and his amanuensis Baruch, especially in horror of the heathen idolatry. Of the books of Maccabees the first is the more important. It comprises the religious oppressions under Antiochus Epiphanes, with the history of the wars under Mattathias and his sons, Judas, Jonathan, and Simon; and is, therefore, the most significant period of the whole history, from the close of the old dispensation under Ezra and Nehemiah unto Christ. An accurate knowledge of it is of importance, because on this depends the understanding of many of the Old Testament prophecies relative to this period, especially those of Zechariah and Daniel. And here we must observe that in the exposition of the prophets, in pursuance of a falsely literal method which culminated in the supranaturalistic expositors of the second half of the last century, especially in Venema and J. D. Michaelis, more honour has been assigned to it than is due. For many have sought to discover in it the fulfilment of prophecies which found at most but one fulfilment—a mode of dealing which is the result of incapacity to apprehend the idea which inspires the prophets, and to appreciate the distinction between prophecy and divination. A more perfect knowledge serves to reveal the worthlessness of this mode of exposition, showing how little the reality in this time corresponded to that which the prophets by inspiration hoped for; and how necessary it is, therefore, to advance further, to fix the glance upon Him in whom all the promises of the prophets are yea and amen. And it is evident that this period lies without the region of canonical history from the fact that it is unduly estimated by those who make it a principal object of prophecy, as well as from the circumstance that it is completely destitute of prophecy itself. A time which proves itself so deficient in the higher vital powers in operation

under Israel, cannot be regarded as that to which the prophecy of earlier times had main reference. It is equally certain that prophecy concerns Israel only in so far as they are a covenant and consequently a spiritual people. By these remarks we also obviate another attempt to give honour where it is not due, viz. the effort of Hitzig and others to assign to the Maccabean period by far the greater portion of the Psalms. Prophecy and psalmody go hand in hand throughout the whole history of Israel. When the former was entirely extinct, the latter could not flourish. And, moreover, if it had flourished, the period could not lie without the region of canonical history. The thing itself was far from making any such pretensions. It had little spirit; but it was conscious of this, and therefore leaned humbly upon the more spiritual past. It is certain that the first book of Maccabees is not without important mistakes, particularly in the statements respecting foreign geography and history. Thus, for example, the account of the Romans in chap. viii. is incorrect almost throughout. In chap. i. 1, the author proceeds on the false assumption that the Persians were driven from the possession of Greece by Alexander the Great. In chap. i. 6-8 he states, contrary to all authentic history, that Alexander during his lifetime divided his kingdom among his assembled generals. But the most flagrant error occurs in chap. vi. 1, where he changes the large territory of Elymais into a town in Persia. These and other errors have been pointed out by Wernsdorff in his acute and learned work, *De fide historica Librorum Maccabaicorum*, 1747; which, however, is not entirely free from polemic embarrassment: it may be compared with the commentary of J. D. Michaelis *On the First Book of Maccabees*. The two supplement one another. For Michaelis goes too far in an opposite direction. He often tries to vindicate the author when he cannot possibly be justified. In Grimm's *Commentary on the First Book of Maccabees* we recognise an attempt to maintain the proper mean between the two extremes. But when the author confines himself within the limits of Palestine and of the nearest past, he proves himself on the whole to be reliable, accurate, and careful; notwithstanding his poetical-prose style, which in many passages, though not always, is somewhat pompous, departing from the simplicity of canonical history, contrasting disagreeably with the attractive simplicity

and objectivity of the canonical history of the Old and New Testaments. Here his statements are very generally confirmed by coins, and by those foreign writers who have occupied themselves with the same period. Because the book contains a faithful account of a most remarkable providence of God, it may with a certain degree of truth be said to be a sacred book, if not by virtue of its composition, yet on account of its contents. We cannot accurately fix the time of its origin. From chap. xvi. 23, 24, we learn that it cannot have been composed until long after the beginning of the reign of John Hyrcanus; and it is probable that it belongs to a period prior to his death, which would otherwise have been mentioned. The assumption of a later authorship is untenable for this reason, that we should then be unable to explain the universally admitted credibility, and especially the chronological accuracy of the book; for nowhere do we find any trace of the employment of older written sources, not even in passages such as chap. ix. 22, where we might expect to find a reference to them, especially if we compare chap. xvi. 23, 24; and, moreover, the author speaks of the Romans, upon whom he bases great hopes, in a manner which presupposes that they had not yet revealed their true character with reference to the Jews. For the rest, the book was originally written in Greek; and we do not hold with most scholars that the Hebrew or Aramaic book of Maccabees, mentioned by Origen and Jerome, is the original, but only a translation. So also the Aramaic Matthew has often erroneously been regarded as the original, on the false assumption that only Aramaic could be written for born Jews. The numerous hebraisms can prove nothing to the contrary, since they are to be found in all Greek works written by Jews; on the same ground we might prove a Hebrew or Aramaic original for all the books of the New Testament. The alleged errors in translation rest on false assumptions. That our Greek book is the original follows from the fact, that the author employs not the Hebrew text but the Alexandrian version of the books of the Old Testament, especially of Daniel; as the use of the LXX. also forms a strong argument in favour of the originality of the Greek Matthew; that Josephus draws always from the Greek as the authentic; and finally, that the book, as even Grimm must concede, is distinguished from the LXX. by a much easier and

more flowing Greek, whence its language does not bear the character of a translation.

The second book of the Maccabees is inferior to the first. It is divided into two parts. The first part is formed by two documents contained in the first two chapters, professedly sent by the Jews in Palestine to the Jews in Egypt after the victories of Judas Maccabeus, in order to summon them to take part in celebrating the consecration of the Temple. There can be no doubt that these letters are a literary fiction; for the whole second book of Maccabees is not so much a proper historical work as a mixture of truth and fiction—an historical romance, something like Wildenhahn's *Spener*. They contain strange fancies; and the author is so bold as to refer to the writings of Moses, of Jeremiah, and of Nehemiah, in which there is not a word of all these things. Hence the references cannot be seriously meant. The second part contains a historical sketch of the time of the Maccabees; it embraces, however, only a comparatively short period. Beginning almost at the same starting-point as the author of the first book, the writer continues the narrative only through a period of fourteen or fifteen years, till the measures taken by Demetrius Soter against Judas Maccabeus in the year 161; while the first book embraces a period of forty years. (The second book runs parallel only with the first seven chapters of the first book.) This second part professes to be an extract from a large work in five books, on the *Acts of the Maccabees*, written by Jason of Cyrene, with a prologue and epilogue. Of this work we do not find the least trace anywhere else; and since the first part resembles the second in construction, there is reason to believe that the author of the pretended letters was also the author of the pretended abstract; a view which has been recently contested by Grimm on insufficient ground. Thus we are to some extent justified in doubting whether this work had any existence whatever. It is possible that it may belong to the region of fiction to which the author has given so much scope. He wrote at a time when dull fictions were in fashion; as may be seen, for example, in Philo of Byblos and the self-named Manetho. However that may be, there can at least be no doubt, especially after the argument of Wernsdorff in the above-mentioned work, that the second part is not much

superior to the first, in so far as its historical character is concerned. Of the author's mistakes when he touches upon foreign geography and history little need be said, since he has them in common with the author of the first book, although he surpasses him in this respect. But even in the history of the nation itself there is much that bears an unhistorical character. The narrative of the first book is in conformity with the character of the whole period from the Babylonian exile to Christ, of whom we have an anticipation in the fact that this period did not become an object of sacred history entirely on natural ground. The author betrays a constant tendency to the marvellous, a weakness of character which this period itself recognised as belonging to it, for it looked to the future alone for the restoration of the prophetic gift, 1 Macc. xiv. 41; renouncing at the same time the possession of supernatural influences. In all other portions of sacred history wonders and prophecies are intimately connected; and this very admixture of the miraculous, which is wanting in the first book, appears to have been a main object of the author in undertaking his work. A judgment which pronounces narratives of this nature to be lies, is scarcely legitimate. The book must not be judged merely from the same point of view as the first of Maccabees; but may be classed with the books of Tobit and Judith. The author intends at the outset to give truth and fiction. We may compare his work to the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon in profane literature. The chronology is throughout incorrect; all events are placed a year too early. The Greek diction of the book is generally pure; but the style is declamatory, with rhetorical ornament, containing moral remarks and digressions; thus contrasting with the objectivity which is maintained by the sacred historical books, whose object throughout is to influence by means of the facts themselves, and whose only care it is to set them forth in clear features and sharp outlines. From these remarks it follows that the book can only have a subordinate value as a historical source, although it contains many valuable historical notices. But on the whole, the historical basis remains always inviolable; and the separation of truth and fiction can generally be accomplished without difficulty. The fiction is for the most part but loosely laid on. The date of composition cannot be fixed. If we may conclude any-

thing from the complete ignorance which Josephus and Philo betray respecting it, it must have been composed at a late time. The oldest allusion to the book is to be found in Clement of Alexandria. The arguments brought forward by Grimm in his *Commentary on the Second, Third, and Fourth Books of Maccabees*, Leipzig 1857, to prove that the book must necessarily have been composed before the destruction of Jerusalem, are not conclusive. Even the references to it in the New Testament, accepted as such by Stier, are liable to well-founded suspicion.

The third book of Maccabees stands much lower, and no longer belongs to the collection of apocryphal works recognised by the church. The title is scarcely appropriate, since it describes a persecution which Ptolemy Philopator (he reigned from 221 to 204 B.C.) is said to have inflicted on the Jews in Egypt; it is however correctly named so far, that the narrative of the author is a romance based upon the relations of the Maccabean time. The book is either pure fiction, or else the circumstance on which it is founded is so enlarged, distorted, and interwoven with the marvellous, that it can no longer be recognised. This requires no proof, as is universally conceded, and is obvious to every one who reads. The work is an Egyptian product, which was not known till very late; and has not been translated in the Vulgate, nor even by Luther. We may regard the Egyptian-Greek insurrection against the Jews as the historical occasion, which occurred in the time of the Roman imperial dominion. The author, writing for the encouragement of his fellow-countrymen, transfers the relations of this time to that of the Ptolemies, in which, according to the testimony of history, no such insurrection took place. He invents a persecution after the pattern of that which occurred in the time of the Maccabees; and sets forth a miraculous, divine deliverance, in order to encourage the Jews in Alexandria under their oppression.

There is still a fourth book of Maccabees, sometimes mentioned by the church fathers. This is in all probability the book of Maccabees which is to be found among the works of Josephus, but which does not belong to him, as may be seen from the gross historical errors which appear in it. It is found also in many MSS. and editions of the Alexandrian

version. That the book has no properly historical, but only a philosophical tendency, is evident from the title, *περὶ σωφροσύνης*, or *αὐτοκρατόρος λογισμοῦ*. The author wishes to treat of the relation which ought to subsist between the rational will and the sensuous impulses. In order to show the possibility of a reckless limitation of the latter, he relates the histories of the Maccabees from the Maccabean time. According to Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 10, the book was composed in the latter half of the first century. In chap. xiii. 14 there is an allusion to Matt. x. 28, whence, however, we are not at liberty to conclude that the book was written by a Christian, against which there are many data.

In the remaining apocryphal books also, especially in those of Tobit, Judith, Baruch, etc., are to be found many historical statements; but on account of the whole historical character of the books, and the time and region from which they went forth—they are mostly Alexandrian productions—these statements must be used with great caution, and can only serve to confirm what has been drawn from other sources. The books of Tobit and Judith are historically clothed fictions; the former throughout a contemplative, lovely poem; the latter presenting offences against morality, but at the same time containing a noble germ—a fund of ardent faith and a lively fear of God. They are important as monuments of the spirit of the time in which they were written—in this respect also the books of Jesus Sirach and Wisdom are of equal importance, which together with Tobit, Baruch, and the first of Maccabees, are the noblest products of apocryphal literature.

The fourth native source is formed by Jewish writers whose works are to be found neither among the canonical nor among the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. Among these Flavius Josephus takes the first rank. Born in the year 37 A.D., in the reign of the Emperor Caligula, and carefully instructed in the Jewish code of law, he joined himself to the sect of the Pharisees. When his people revolted against the Romans, he contended boldly at their head, acting as field-general in Galilee; but was taken prisoner by Vespasian. To him he foretold the imperial dominion, in an interpretation of Daniel's prophecy, chap. ix., according to which Jerusalem was to be destroyed by a heathen prince; and when this prediction was fulfilled he was

set free by the Emperor and richly rewarded. He now received from his patron the surname of Flavius, and accompanied Titus, in the 33d year of his age, to the siege of Jerusalem, where he assumed the office of a negotiator, and besought its inhabitants to surrender—but in vain; the penetration which saw through existing relations could avail nothing against fanaticism—the less, because his character was not calculated to inspire confidence. After the conquest of Jerusalem he went to Rome with Titus, who was particularly gracious to him, and whose favour he sought to use as much as possible for the good of his unfortunate countrymen. In the year 93 he was still alive. That of his death is unknown. The following are his works, in chronological order:—

1. Seven books of the Jewish war and of the destruction of Jerusalem. This work was originally written in Syro-Chaldaic, and was afterwards translated into Greek and presented to Vespasian and Titus. Considerable credibility is due to it. Josephus tells in his autobiography that Titus with his own hand wrote upon it the command that it should be publicly made known, *χαράξας τῇ ἑαυτοῦ χειρὶ τὰ βιβλία δημοσιεύσαι προσέταξεν*, words which some have erroneously understood to mean that Titus, famed for his readiness in writing, copied out the whole book himself. Josephus tells also in his autobiography how King Agrippa assured him that he had written this history the most carefully and accurately of all. We must take care, however, not to place too much value on their assurances. They only testify to the historical truth as a whole. In many details, especially where chronology is concerned, we perceive that want of the true historic mind, which appears in his remaining works, and for which no autopsy can compensate. The fact that many have undertaken to justify all these details (especially v. Raumer in his *Geography of Palestine*) betrays the lack of a complete view of the individuality of Josephus. The analogies which he brings forward with much learning in favour of everything strange and improbable could only hold good if his individuality had been quite different from what it really was; if he could be cleared from the reproach of credulousness, of superstition, and that love of exaggeration and of obscurity which leads him to follow not only the great aim of the historian, viz.

truth, but at the same time other subordinate ends. That the description of the temple which Josephus gives in this work, as well as that in his *Antiquities*, are in many details confused and in others undoubtedly exaggerated; that national vanity and the peculiarity of his position led him to embellish and beautify for the glory of his nation—all this has been thoroughly established by Robinson in his *Travels*, part ii. p. 53, etc. But, on the other hand, we cannot fail to see that we have to do with a contemporary and perfectly informed historian who on the whole wished to tell the truth, and was obliged to tell it.

2. *Ἰουδαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία*, Jewish history in twenty books, from the beginning of the world to the year 66 A.D., when the Jews again rebelled against the Romans; so that the work may be regarded as a continuation of the Jewish war. It was written at Rome. Josephus states at the end of his last book that he completed it in the thirteenth year of Domitian, in the 56th year of his age. It is therefore almost contemporaneous with the last book of the New Testament, the Apocalypse, which was written about three years later. In the choice of a title, and in his division, Josephus seems to have imitated Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who had written a Roman archæology in twenty books. The value of this history is various, according to the times of which it treats. The period embraced in the historical books of the Old Testament is comparatively small, and may be reckoned a help rather than a source; having for the most part no greater authority than a modern elaboration of the Old Testament history, so that it becomes a matter of great surprise that many, even in recent times, should thoughtlessly quote Josephus as an authority for the history of the period. Besides the books of the Old Testament, which he read mostly not in the original, but the Alexandrian translation, which is in some parts very defective, and which we, with our aids, can understand much more thoroughly, he employed no native sources except oral tradition, of whose miserable state we have ample proof in the accounts he has taken from it; for example, the history of the march of Moses against the Ethiopians, of the Ethiopian princess who offered him her hand, of the magic arts of Solomon, etc. If we take pleasure in such stories, it is just as easy to invent them for ourselves as

to borrow them from Josephus. He is also deficient in the power of transporting himself to ancient times, partly owing to his participation in the unhistorical Alexandrian tendency, a circumstance which leads him also to adopt the allegorical mode of interpretation; but what is more prejudicial to his work is the fact that he continually aims at writing history in a way which should give no offence to the heathen for whom his work was specially intended, but might rather remove their prejudices against the Jews, or their contempt of them. Sly tact, cunning, and craftiness—such is the character of Josephus as he appears in his own description of his personal relations; and we recognise the same characteristics in his history. The fact that his aim is not purely historical, that history serves him rather as a means to a special end, is the key to explain a multitude of phenomena which his work presents. The injury which must accrue to history from such an apologetic attempt has been seen whenever that course has been adopted; but it appears most strikingly in the second half of the last century, when theologians like Michaelis, Less, and Jerusalem diluted and distorted biblical history, attempting by the most far-fetched hypotheses to make it agreeable to the spirit of a time which was alien to it. In Josephus, the detrimental influence of this mode of treatment may be seen in double measure. First, he seeks to place his favourite people higher than they are placed in the sacred record, and to invest them with the attributes which the heathen prized most highly. Like Philo, he assigns to the Patriarchs and Moses a wisdom like that which he found among the Greeks and Grecizing Romans of his own day. Again, in recording the miraculous events which demanded particularly strong faith, fearing to compromise himself or to lose a favourable hearing for that which was to be accepted, he either speaks in vague language or by silence weakens the impression of the miraculous. Thus, for example, he remarks on the narrative of the passage through the Red Sea that he relates the story as he finds it in the holy Scripture, leaving it to each one to decide whether the circumstance was effected by direct divine influence or by natural causes. We can scarcely suppose that remarks of this nature are suggested by Josephus' own doubt and uncertainty, as is the case with the above-named theologians of the last century; but must regard them rather as the product of a peda-

gogic prudence, so to speak ; which frequently appears elsewhere in reference to the Messianic hopes for example, where far too little distinction has been made between what Josephus says and what he believes. But that which gives him some value even where ancient history is concerned, is the use of foreign historical authors who are lost, from whom he has brought forward many explanations and confirmations of the biblical narrative. Yet we must use great caution with respect to this evidence ; for the writers belong to a bad period, that which succeeded Alexander, where historic falsification played a very important part, especially in Alexandria, in which authorship was made a profession ; prefiguring our present literary activity, and authors wrote in the service of the various national vanities which there intermingled, seeking in literature the satisfaction denied them in politics. On nearer consideration, the really important extracts of Josephus are reducible to a very small number. What he quotes from Menander's *Greek Elaboration of the Tyrian Journals* is by far the most important. Next in value are the communications from Berosus, which, however, are of importance only so far as they have reference to the time of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors. For the history of the last period comprised in the books of the Old Testament no dependence can be placed on Josephus. Here he has little which is original, little that surpasses the canonical Ezra and the books of Nehemiah and Esther ; and even this little is of inferior quality. It is in a great measure taken from the apocryphal book of Ezra, whose statements, in themselves uncertain, are still further distorted by the conjectures and false combinations of Josephus. He used no other sources for this period. Comp. the translation of Kleinert, *Treatise on Ezra and Nehemiah*, Dorpat Contributions, part i. p. 162 *et seq.* But Josephus has far greater weight when he treats of the time from the conclusion of the Old Testament to the end of his work. For whole periods, from the conclusion of the Old Testament to the Maccabees, he is almost our only source, though indeed very meagre. At this time the causes which led him to represent the earlier periods had mostly disappeared ; and his credibility respecting it may be gathered partly from the internal character of his narrative and partly from the accounts of profane writers. Where we might feel

tempted to question his statements, as in the account of Alexander's sojourn at Jerusalem, a closer examination sometimes serves to confirm them. It cannot be denied, however, that great caution should be used in accepting what he says, even where it has reference to this period; and that not a few incorrect statements are to be found; for he never quite belies his character. His testimony is unreliable particularly when he treats of the time he assigns to the apostate priest Manasseh, and to the beginning of the temple at Gerizim. He is not even accurately acquainted with the succession of the Persian kings. From the great poverty of his sources, it is evident he does not draw from important ones. Historic certainty increases as he comes nearer to his own time, but is not unqualified even here; for the absence of other, earlier occasions of error, are replaced by a new one, his personal vanity.

3. *De vita sua*, autobiography of Josephus, valuable first of all for the knowledge which it reveals of his individuality, so indispensable to the formation of a just estimate of his larger works; and also for the knowledge of the history of his time, and of the contemporary religious and civil condition of the Jews. In determining the date of the composition of his *Antiquities*, we fix that of this book also. It forms, as Josephus himself tells us at the end of the twentieth book, an appendix to it; and is therefore not improperly quoted by Eusebius under the name of the *Antiquities*. It is not so much a complete biography as a record for the vindication of his conduct in the Jewish war, which was attacked on so many sides.

4. On the antiquities of the Jewish nation. Josephus was prompted to undertake this work by the quackish polyhistor Apion, who had attacked the antiquity of the Jewish nation, and had brought forward many unfounded calumnies against them in the interest of the Greco-Egyptian enmity to the Jews, which was prevalent in the time of the Roman imperial dominion, especially in Alexandria. But Josephus was not satisfied to refute him alone; he also noticed the calumnies of Apollonius Molo and other writers. This book is important for Old Testament history, because it contains a number of fragments from lost works of Phœnician, Egyptian, and Babylonish historians; with reference to which, however, we must repeat the remark already made respecting the *Antiquities*. The

defence of Josephus is often as inaccurate as the attack against which it is directed. Without criticism he heaps together everything which can serve his purpose. The historically-veiled polemics he combats had adopted Jewish accounts of ancient history, altering them to suit themselves; and had then represented them as resting on independent heathen tradition. Josephus never fully uncovers this literary deception; he unmasks the impostors only so far as it serves his national interest; and allows their testimony to pass when he can turn it to his own advantage. Nor has he any hesitation in overlooking the deception of the Jewish writers who represented themselves as heathens, that in this character they might more effectually weaken heathen calumnies and glorify the antiquity and grandeur of their nation by testimony apparently coming from an enemy. He never seems to entertain the idea of unmasking them. It follows from these remarks that the books against Apion can only be used as a historical source, with the greatest caution.

Among the Jews Josephus found little acceptance, partly on account of the language in which his works (with the exception of the books of the Jewish war) were written, partly also because he was looked upon as an apostate. So much the more highly was he valued by the Christians, for whom the books on the Jewish war must have had special interest, as forming an excellent apology for Christianity against Judaism; and for all that relates to the relations existing in the time of Christ, which to the present day forms an invaluable mine in proving the genuine historical character of the Gospels. Even the earliest church writers, as Clement of Alexandria and Origen, show an intimate acquaintance with him. Eusebius, in his *Church History*, quotes whole sections from his books on the Jewish war. The Latin translation was several times printed in the fifteenth century. A German one, by Hedio, was also in existence, Strasb. 1531, when at Basle 1544, the first edition of the Greek original appeared. The most common edition is that by Ittig. By far the best, however, is that of Haverkamp, Amsterdam 1726, 2 vols. fol.; indispensable for every one who wishes to become thoroughly familiar with Josephus. It is provided with a tolerably rich critical apparatus, but is unfortunately very inadequate in respect of exegesis.

To the native sources we may reckon also the pseudo-epigraphs of the Old Testament, collected by Fabricius in the *Cod. Pseudepigr. V. T.*, Hamb. 1713, 1723, 2 vols.—viz. such writings as are falsely attributed to the most important men of the Old Testament—Enoch, for example; while the apocryphal books are certainly genuine, but not canonical; and are distinguished from native works, like those of Josephus, by a certain authority which they have obtained in the synagogue, and in the church as a sort of uncanonical supplement to the canon. The pseudo-epigraphs have the dignity of sources more with regard to later Jewish modes of thought and dogmas than in reference to isolated facts; for where the latter are concerned, they must in the nature of things be highly uncertain, and do in fact abound with absurd fables. Even Philo (born in the year 20 B.C.) is only so far to be regarded as a source as his writings set forth the character of Alexandrian Judaism; the peculiar form which Judaism assumed in Egypt, owing to contact with the Greek mind. For historical facts he is a bad guarantee; owing to his morbid dominant subjectivity, which always transfers itself to the object; and on account of his unhistorical, idealising manner of thought. Even where he speaks of the present, and from his own observation, as in his account of the Therapeutæ, there is such a mixture of truth and fiction, of the ideal and the actual, that we must regret, in the absence of more sober witnesses, to be obliged to accept him as our authority. The historic accounts of the Talmud belong to a time when the perception of truth among the Jews had so utterly disappeared, that the narrators themselves were no longer conscious of the distinction between truth and fiction. This is also the case with respect to other old Jewish writings, such as the book *Sohar*, and the ancient allegorical commentaries on the Bible known under the name of *Rabboth*. In all history there is scarcely an example of a nation in whom the perception of truth generally, but especially of historic truth, was so completely enfeebled as among the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem. In this respect they are related to other nations in an inverse ratio to their ancestors; a phenomenon which will appear strange only to those who are incapable of apprehending its deeper causes, comp. John v. 43; to which we may add

national vanity in union with the deepest degradation—a union which everywhere proves itself a potentiality destructive of history, but most strikingly in Egypt—isolation; a base mind thinking only of gain; and the one-sidedness of studies directed to mere subtleties. The analogy of the modern Greeks to the Greeks of antiquity suffices at least to show how little we are authorized to infer the unhistorical tendency of Israel from that of later Judaism.

The only national monuments which serve to illustrate the history are coins of the time of the Maccabees, whose genuineness was triumphantly established in the contest between Bayer and Tychsen, amply detailed in Hartmann's biography of the latter.

Let us now pass to the foreign sources of Old Testament history. These are divided into two classes—accounts which directly refer to the Jews, and those which indirectly bear upon Hebrew history in setting forth the history of the nations with whom the Jews came into contact. We shall speak first of the former. In the later East we find strange traditions and sayings concerning Old Testament history, which, though not without manifold interest, have but little historical value,—the less because they may generally be recognised as embellishments and distortions of the accounts preserved in later times by Jews and Christians. This is especially the case when they have reference to the Koran; and what has not been sufficiently recognised—to the traditions of the Arabs concerning their own early history and their descent from Kahtan (Joktan) and Ishmael, which have perhaps no independent basis, being certainly developed under Jewish influence, which was very powerful in Arabia in the centuries preceding Mohammed.

Greek and Roman authors were not well informed respecting the affairs of the Jews, and drew from bad sources; from contempt they did not trouble themselves to inquire into the truth, and from hatred they would not see it. But especially regarding the more ancient, the pre-Babylonish history of the Jews; Greek and Roman history contributes very little which is valid, as may be inferred from the remarkable circumstance that previous to the time of Alexander no Greek author mentions the name of the Jews. Herodotus represents them only

as Syrians in Palestine; and has evidently very obscure ideas respecting them; although what he tells of the conquest of Cadytis by Necho is of no little importance for the conflict between Egypt and Judah in the time of Josiah, of which the books of Kings and Chronicles tell nothing. Many writers, most of whom, however, seem to belong to the lowest class, composed separate works on the Jews; but none are now in existence. Fragments are to be found in Josephus, *c. Ap.*, and in Eusebius, in the *Chronicon* and in *Praepar. Ev.* These two works are important for the history of the Old Testament. In the *Chronicon* the sole aim of Eusebius is to bring forward confirmation of Old Testament history from heathen authors whose works have for the most part been lost—whether they gave accounts concerning the Jews, or only explained and confirmed what the Scriptures told of foreign nations. For a long period we had to content ourselves with fragments of Jerome's Latin translation of this chronicle, which were collected and learnedly discussed by Scaliger under the title of *Thesaurus temporum*, first at Leyden 1606, afterwards in a second enlarged edition at Amsterdam, 1658. But the whole has been preserved in the Armenian language; and first appeared in the year 1818, in Armenian and Latin, at Venice, in 2 vols. 4to, with many annotations. This is an addition to the treasury of sources for Old Testament history. To it we owe many illustrations and confirmations of that history, taken from otherwise unknown fragments; especially with regard to the objects of the embassy which, according to the book of Kings, was sent from Babylon to Hezekiah; and concerning the narrative in the six first chapters of Daniel. The whole ninth book of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* serves the same purpose. For the rest, that which has been said of Josephus also holds good in the case of Eusebius. We must be particularly cautious in using his authorities; for they are generally bad late writers who quote as the original a copy of the copy of the Old Testament narrative, in which but few genuine features remain. Everything which these authors—Nicolaus Damasc., Alex. Polyhistor, Artapanus, Eupolemus, etc.—can tell of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and even of Moses, bears the same relation to the Old Testament as the statements of the Koran; and is of no more importance; so that we cannot

help wondering how men like Hess can make so much of these statements; or how v. Bohlen, Tuch, Lengerke, Bertheau, and others can treat them as almost equal in value to the Mosaic account. Other Greek and Latin authors still extant give passing accounts of the Jews. Thus *Diodorus Siculus*, lib. i. chap. v.; Strabo, in the tenth book of his *Geography*; Justin, in the second chapter of the thirty-sixth book of his extract from *Trogus Pompejus*; *Tacitus historiarum*, lib. v. chaps. ii.-xiii. Horace, Juvenal, C. Pliny the younger, and Martial also make passing mention of the Jews. The passages from these authors which have reference to the Jews have been diligently collected and explained by many scholars, especially by Schudt, in his *Compendium historiae Judaicae potissimum ex gentiliuin scriptis collectum*, Fkf. a. M. 1700. The latest collection, that of Meyer, *Judaica*, Jena 1832, is incomplete, containing simply the Greek text.

So much for those who occupy themselves directly with the Jews. The nations with whom the Hebrews came most into contact, and whose history is therefore of special importance as bearing upon theirs, are the Egyptians, Phœnicians, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Persians, Greeks, and Romans. With the exception of the Phœnicians, these very nations, and they alone, appear in the Apocalypse as the successive possessors of the sovereignty of the world, under whose yoke the people of God sighed—six heads of the seven-headed beast, under the symbol of which the sovereignty of the world is represented; the seventh head was still future at the time of the Apocalypse. We give here only the principal sources for the history of the five first nations, assuming that the sources of the history of the Greeks and Romans are already known.

The sources of Egyptian history are very meagre. The Egyptians were extremely deficient in the historic faculty, about as much as the Indians. Truth and fiction, mythology and history, were separated by a fluctuating barrier. In olden times, in records which did not relate to the intercourse of common life, they generally made use of hieroglyph or picture-writing, which was liable to much misapprehension in the lapse of time, and gave rise to strange misunderstandings. This source was the more necessarily fluctuating, because such defective writing contained only pompous descriptions of actual

or alleged exploits, never forming a properly historical work, which Egypt does not seem to have possessed at all before the supremacy of the Greeks. Yet to this source, to uncertain oral tradition, and to old monuments, the Egyptians were limited in the time of Herodotus; and to them, not to mention the Old Testament, we owe directly or indirectly all we know of Egyptian history. We must remember, also, that national vanity induced the priests to conceal their ignorance by fabrication; to be silent respecting many facts that were disagreeable; and to distort others. They had one particular quality, which has been very aptly designated *virtuosity* by O. Müller in his work *Orchomenos* and the *Minyans*, by virtue of which they appropriated foreign histories and traditions respecting their country; and after metamorphosing them to their own advantage, gave them out as originally Egyptian; a virtuosity by which they often imposed on the Greeks, but which they also applied to the Jews. Among native Egyptian authors the most important is Manetho, which is not saying much unfortunately,—he was professedly a priest at the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, about 260 years B.C. He wrote by order of the king, as is alleged, a copious history of his people in the Greek tongue, from the oldest traditionary time to that of Darius Codomannus, who was conquered by Alexander. But my treatise, *Manetho and the Hyksos*, as an appendix to the work entitled *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, brings forward many important reasons why Manetho could not have written as a born and exalted Egyptian under Ptolemy Philadelphus; and assigns to him or to the person who appropriated his perhaps honoured name, a much later time, probably that of the Roman emperors. Fragments of what the alleged Manetho wrote concerning the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt and their exodus, have been preserved by Josephus, in his first book against Apion. These fragments, which have been so much built upon, are more important for a knowledge of the Alexandrian spirit than of the events they record. We might just as well follow the *Uranios* of Simonides as take Manetho for our guide in this matter. The lists of the Egyptian kings have been excerpted by Julius Africanus; from whom Eusebius transferred them to his Chronicle. These lists of names have more importance than anything else that has been preserved.

Although even here the ground is very uncertain, especially in the whole series of the first fifteen dynasties, for the most part the result of patriotic fabrication; yet many names receive confirmation from the most recent discoveries. But we are not authorized to infer the correctness of his narrative from that of these lists of names, for he had very different sources at his command for the names; they occur numberless times on the monuments, and from them a certain number of kings' names might very readily be copied with accuracy. In the time of the Roman emperors an Egyptian named Chäremón, notorious even among the ancients for his ignorance and unreliableness, wrote a work on Egyptian history, which has also been lost; but Josephus in his first book, *c. Ap.*, has preserved the part which relates to the Hebrews. As a reason for the odious accounts which these and other Egyptian writers, such as Lysimachus and Apion, give of the Jews, Josephus adduces the ancient national hatred perpetuated from the time of the settlement of the Hebrews in Egypt. But there was unquestionably a far more powerful cause in the envy of the Egyptians, whose hatred was afterwards transferred to the Greeks dwelling in their country,—envy on account of the favours which the Jews enjoyed in Egypt after the time of Alexander; combined with a knowledge of the accounts of their forefathers contained in the Pentateuch, which, especially in the Alexandrian version, were extremely offensive to the national vanity of the Egyptians. So far as we know at least, there is no reason for assuming that the Egyptians had independent traditions relative to their original relations with the Hebrews. They sought to supply this deficiency by inventions, which may be recognised as such because they are throughout based upon the biblical narrative, and give such a turn to the history, and that generally in a very awkward way, that it no longer offends but subserves the national vanity. Since so little of the native writings of the Egyptians has been preserved, we must welcome even what has been said by foreign writers concerning ancient Egypt. Of these, the oldest and most important is Herodotus, who collected accounts of ancient history, from the mouth of the priests, about seventy years after the subjugation of the Egyptians by the Persians. Although the source was very

muddy even then, it flowed considerably purer than at the time of Manetho. Thus Herodotus knows nothing of the whole Hyksos-fable of Manetho; nor is this to be wondered at, for the cause was not yet in existence which afterwards gave rise to it, viz. the relation to the Jews. Among the editions of Herodotus that by Bähr is the most important and indispensable for the elaborators of Old Testament history, on account of its rich apparatus. Next in value comes the manual of Stein. Four hundred years later, Diodorus Siculus gave a compilation of accounts respecting ancient history, partly from oral inquiries made in Egypt, partly from Greek authors. Diodorus has taken a fancy to set up the Egyptians as a model; and we seem often to be reading a historical romance rather than a history. In Plutarch, also, we find an exaggerated reverence for the Egyptians, and an effort to make them the representatives of his ideal. It is only with the utmost caution that we can avail ourselves of the historical material of these and similar writers. Each one finds his favourite idea realized in the Egyptians. This unhistorical tendency meets us in its grossest form among the Neo-platonists. In recent times, especially since the French expedition to Egypt, Egyptian antiquity has been made the subject of many learned investigations. The results of these are principally contained in the works of Rosellini and Wilkinson. Recent discoveries, however, have imparted less knowledge of the history of ancient Egypt than of its domestic, civil, and religious condition; for the numerous pictures and sculptures in the subterranean recesses afford such superabundant materials for the latter, that a recent English author has justly remarked that we are better acquainted with the court of the Pharaohs than with that of the Plantagenets. Notwithstanding the work of Bunsen, so rich in hypotheses, which Leo has followed far too incautiously in the third edition of his *History of the World*; and in spite of the work of Lepsius, the history still remains in confusion, from which it will never be possible to extricate it let us discover and decipher what we will, because the Egyptians never had a history.

For Phœnician history, so far as it is incorporated in that of the Old Testament, we possess no native sources, since the fragments which have come down to us from the alleged Greek

translation of the very old Phœnician historian Sanchuniathon, edited by Orelli in a separate collection, contains only a cosmogony and theogony, and can therefore be of use only for that portion of the Mosaic narrative which lies beyond our province. Moreover, the alleged translation is certainly an original, the whole a composition of Philo who lived under Nero until Hadrian; and a Sanchuniathon for whose existence we have no testimony except that of Philo probably never lived at all; comp. my *Contributions*, ii. p. 110 *et seq.* Josephus accords special praise to Dios, from whom he gives a fragment relative to the relation between Solomon and Hiram, in his book against Apion. Besides this, he communicates isolated fragments from Menander of Ephesus, who wrote in Tyre, and drew from Tyrian annals a history of Tyre. These fragments show that the alleged works bore quite another character than the composition of Philo, which had no historical aim whatever, but only a dogmatic one, viz. to bring forward an ancient authority for his atheism. But even these authors are not to be trusted without qualification. What Dios relates of riddle-contest between Hiram and Solomon, which he professed to draw from an old Phœnician source, is, to judge from the fact on which it is based, manifestly of Jewish origin; supplemented by ready additions which owe their origin to Tyrian national vanity. Owing to the scantiness of native historical sources, Greek authors are almost the only co-narrators for the biblical authors with reference to their statements concerning Phœnician history, and are certainly very ill-informed.

For Assyrian history also, we have till now no native sources. What knowledge we may gain from the discoveries made in the last ten years (it is believed that annals of the Assyrian kingdom have been found written on the bricks) must in the main be waited for. Till now a safe contribution has been gained only for archæology, not for history. Even Marcus Niebuhr, in his *History of Assyria and Babylon*, has not ventured to build with certainty upon the alleged decipherments of Assyrian texts. Till now the principal sources have been the fragments of Ktesias, best edited by Bähr, with a copious historical commentary; and the compiler Diodorus Siculus.

The history of the Babylonians and Chaldæans was for a long time distinct,—the Chaldæans were represented as having been

first transplanted into Babylon Proper by the Assyrians, but have been proved to be identical by recent inquiries, especially by Hupfeld, and Delitzsch on Habakkuk,—the Chaldæans being the original inhabitants of Babylon, or a separate, prominent branch of them. Thus we possess two native sources for the history of these nations, both important for Old Testament history, although they have come down to us only as fragments of comparatively small compass. Berosus, a priest of Bel at Babylon, wrote professedly under the dominion of the Seleucidæ about the year 262 B.C., a Chaldæan or Babylonish history in three books, of which fragments are preserved by Josephus, and by Eusebius in the *Praep. Ev.* and in the *Chronic.*, and have been put together in a separate work by Richter. The work of Berosus was highly esteemed in ancient times, and is frequently quoted by Greek and Roman authors. To judge by the fragments which have come down to us, it seems on the whole to have deserved its good name, though even here the influence of the fatal period in which it originated is unmistakable. When Berosus does not wander into prehistoric times, and when his national vanity found no opportunity of exercising its injurious influence on him or his guarantees, his statements are trustworthy and of importance for the explanation and confirmation of the Biblical narrative, especially in the history of Nebuchadnezzar. The Chaldæan historical consciousness probably did not go beyond the period in which that people first attained to historical importance. What lay beyond was full of mythologumena and borrowed matter, on which the stamp of the Babylonish spirit was impressed. With respect to primitive times especially, the whole East is dependent on the Old Testament; an important position, which will be certified by every sound historical investigation. Nothing but the most determined prejudice can avoid seeing this in Berosus. What he tells of the Flood, of the Ark in which Noah was saved, its resting upon the summit of the Armenian mountains, cannot have been drawn from old native records, notwithstanding his express assertion to that effect—(1.) because it coincides too exactly with the statements of Holy Scripture; and (2.) because at the time when the Jews were still shut out from intercourse with the world, no trace is to be found among the heathen of such accounts. The second author who

has drawn directly from Chaldæan tradition is Abydenus. (Comp. Niebuhr's observations respecting him in the treatise, *On the Historical Gain to be derived from the Armenian Chronicle of Eusebius*, printed in vol. i. of his historico-philological writings.) The time in which he lived cannot be accurately determined. It is certain that he wrote later than Berosus. We infer this partly from the circumstance that he knew and made use of that work; and partly from the fact that he found tradition in a much more disfigured condition. Eusebius has preserved fragments of his work, *περὶ τῆς τῶν Χαλδαίων βασιλείας*, in the *Praep. Ev.* and the *Chronicon*. Abydenus is far inferior to Berosus; he narrates in such a confused and uncertain way, that it is difficult to gain any clear sense of what he means. Nevertheless his fragments are of some importance; not, indeed, as is generally thought, for the first eleven chapters of Genesis, where we willingly allow the confirmation which he is said to afford, especially for the building of the Tower of Babel; but for the time of the captivity and that which immediately followed it. He gives some welcome notices of the history of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors. Among Greek authors we find only very scattered, scanty, and uncertain notices of ancient Babylonish and Chaldæan history. A remarkable proof of the great ignorance of the Greeks in this portion of history is, that none of their historians, not even Herodotus, has a syllable relative to the great world-conqueror, Nebuchadnezzar.

For the history and antiquities of the Persians we possess no native written sources. Their national annals, so often mentioned in Scripture, have been lost. The decipherment of old Persian inscriptions is a recent thing; and however interesting the results already attained may be as they are put together in Benfey's work, *Persian Cuneiform-inscriptions, with a Translation and Glossary*, Leipzig 1847, and briefly in the last edition of Leo's *World-History*; yet they have contributed nothing of any moment for our immediate purpose, the explanation of Old Testament history. The most important thing which has yet been deciphered is the inscription of Bisutan, in which Darius Hystaspis describes his achievements—the Darius of the books of Ezra, Haggai, and Zechariah. We must, therefore, adhere to the older Greek historians, who drew from

Persian sources, which, however, were unfortunately very much obscured by national vanity; hence their accounts are frequently contradictory in the most important matters. Those who have most weight are Ktesias, preserved only in fragments; Herodotus, and Xenophon. Of the latter the *Cyropaedia* is important, especially for the period in which the history of the Persians comes into contact with that of the Israelites. Notwithstanding its ideal tendency, this work has in many respects more historical credibility than Herodotus and Ktesias; and strikingly coincides with biblical-historical statements, especially those in the book of Daniel. The knowledge of the religion of the ancient Persians is of importance for the religious history of the Old Testament. No heathen religion presents so many separate coincidences with the Old Testament. It is enough, by way of illustration, to draw attention to the doctrines of the creation, of the fall, of evil spirits, of a revealer of the hidden God, and of a Redeemer. And here arises the interesting problem, how these coincidences, which really contain an infinitely greater difference, are to be explained; a problem which cannot be solved without a thorough knowledge of the history of the Persian religion. The first who gained great merit concerning Persian religious history was Hyde, in the work entitled *De Religione vet. Persarum*. With great diligence and acuteness he made use of those sources which were available in his day, so that his work is still indispensable. New disclosures were made when Anquetil du Perron found the Zendavesta among the descendants of the ancient Persians in India, who had there remained faithful to the religion of their forefathers while in Persia itself the ancient religion had been supplanted by Mohammedism; he made it known in a French translation now recognised as very inaccurate, with learned researches, Paris 1771. Its genuineness was at first attacked by many scholars; afterwards, for a long time, doubts seem to have been almost entirely silenced; while the most exaggerated assumptions respecting the antiquity of these books, and the period in which their alleged author, Zoroaster, appeared, were universally accepted. To Stuhr, particularly in his *Religious Systems of the East*, p. 346 *et seq.*, belongs the merit of reviving the old doubts, and of having proved that Zoroaster himself probably did not live till the time of Darius Hystaspis. The

matter is very uncertain, however; and Niebuhr has justly remarked that, owing to the prevailing mythical character of the accounts of Zoroaster, it will never be possible to succeed in ascertaining with certainty the period in which he lived. Stuhr showed also that the religious books in their present form belong to a very late time; and that, in judging of them, we must distinguish between the original matter and later additions. With this correct settlement of the age of the Zend books, the treatment of the earlier indicated problems is brought back upon the right track, from which an uncritical admiration of the books had withdrawn it. So long as the Zendavesta was placed fifteen hundred years before Christ, there were but two solutions of the problem possible—either the coincidence was to be explained from common participation in the original revelation; or else the Israelites must be made dependent on the Medo-Persians. Now, on the contrary, a far more natural mode of explanation has been suggested. Spiegel, *Avesta*, part i. p. 13, says: "Obviously very little in the writings of the Zendavesta which have come down to us proceeds from Zoroaster himself, perhaps nothing at all; the greater part is the work of different, and mostly later authors." He observes also, p. 11: "In this historical time the Persians certainly borrowed much from their more cultivated Semitic neighbours. If a statement accords with a foreign one, we may, in most cases, assume that it is borrowed." Krüger, according to whom Zoroaster was a younger contemporary of Jeremiah, in his *History of the Assyrians and Iranians*, Frankfort 1856, assumes Jewish influence in the history of our first parents and their fall. Thus, after the relation had for a long time been reversed with great confidence, we have gone back essentially to the very point where we were two hundred years ago. The learned and sober Prideaux makes Zoroaster to have appeared under Darius Hystaspis, maintains that he borrowed much from the Old Testament, and draws a parallel between him and Mohammed. Heeren, in his *Ideas*, has made most successful researches into the Zend religion in its relation to the Persian State; and Rhode, in his work entitled *The Religious System of the ancient Bactrians, Persians, and Medes*, Frankfort 1826, has explained the religious system, as such, with acuteness, it is true, but from utterly untenable.

uncritical presuppositions, and with a great tendency to arbitrary hypothesis. The totally divergent representations of Stuhr, and of Röth, in his *History of Western Philosophy*, 2d ed., 1863, show how far the inquiry is still removed from a satisfactory conclusion. Owing to the nature of the subject, a really satisfactory result is scarcely attainable; for the Persian religion, by its fluctuating character, is not open to exact determination; and in consequence of the Persian tendency to mix religions, favoured by this character, it has appropriated a multitude of foreign elements from Judaism, from the Indian religion, from Christianity, and from Mohammedism, which it is very difficult to discriminate, and can often be done only by conjecture. The Orientalist, Röth of Tübingen, has given an interesting survey of the religious system of the Persians, *Tübingen Theological Year-Book of 1849*, in two parts. To the Persian religious books, in their present form, he assigns no greater antiquity than the end of the Sassanide kingdom, in harmony with the tradition of the Persians themselves, according to which their old and original religious books are said to have been lost (comp. Leo, p. 193). Röth places Zoroaster considerably earlier than Stuhr. Röth agrees with the latter in other respects, but assumes that in the Persian religious books Zoroaster had already become a mythical personage.

The sole foreign monument for the illustration of Israelitish history was for a long time the triumphal arch of Titus, still standing at Rome, upon which are represented the golden table, the golden candlestick, together with two censers and the trumpets, perhaps also the holy codex, all of which, according to Josephus, were publicly carried in triumph. This monument has been copied and learnedly discussed by Hadrian Reland in his work, *De spoliis templi Hierosolymitani in arcu Titiano Romæ conspicuis*, Utrecht 1706. A new edition, with valuable observations by Schulze, appeared in 1765. It was reserved, however, for the present century to discover important monumental confirmations of Old Testament history in Egypt. The scene in a grave at Bni Hassan, strangers arriving in Egypt, is doubtful, though some have regarded it as a representation of the entrance of the Children of Israel (comp. *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, p. 37); but, on the other hand, a monument which has been discovered in Thebes, representing the Hebrews

making bricks, is undoubtedly genuine and of great importance. Rosellini first gave a copy and description of this (comp. *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, p. 79 *et seq.*). The earlier mentioned representation of the personified kingdom of Judah on an Egyptian sculpture of the time of Rehoboam, is also genuine.

3. *Aids to the History of the Old Testament.*

The literature of Old Testament history properly begins after the Reformation, for the only coherent representation of the time of the church fathers, viz. the *Historia Sacra* of Sulpicius Severus, best edited by Halm, Vienna 1867, can scarcely be taken into consideration; since it possesses no other excellence than pious thought and elegant language. It begins with the creation of the world, and continues the history to the end of the fourth century. Those Greek and Latin authors of the middle ages who have expatiated on Israelitish history are still less deserving of mention; for they were deficient in almost every requisite for the success of their undertaking. Yet there are many excellent things, many correct points of view, many single observations relative to the history of the Old Testament, which the historian must not overlook in the works of the church fathers; especially in those of Augustine, particularly in his work *De civitate Dei*; of Chrysostom and of Theodoret. The same may be said of the writings of the Reformers, none of whom has contributed a proper treatise on Old Testament history. They first brought to light again that distinction of the Old and New Testament which had been obscured in the middle ages, and had been very imperfectly apprehended even by the church fathers. Thus a basis was secured for Old Testament history, without which it must necessarily have missed its aim. In matters of detail, also, their works afford rich resources, especially those of Luther, particularly his *Commentary on Genesis*; and of Calvin, especially his *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, the *Book of Joshua*, the *Psalms*, and *Daniel*, as also his *Institutes*. The numerous works on the history of the Old Testament, written after the Reformation, of which we can here name only the most important, are divided into three classes—those written before the spread of rationalism, works of rationalistic authors, and

works of authors who still believed in revelation after the beginning of rationalism.

The first class may be subdivided into two different kinds of works—those in which the theological, and those in which the historical, element preponderates. The most important of the former class are the following: From the Catholic Church, the *Historia Ecclesiastica V. et N. T.*, by Natalis Alexander, Paris 1699, 8 vols. fol., and several times later edited. From the Reformed Church, Frederick Spanheim, *Historia Ecclesiastica a condito Adamo ad aevum Christianum*, in the first volume of his works, Leyden 1701; and the *Hypotyposis Historiae et Chronologiae Sacrae*, by Campeg. Vitringa, still valuable as a compendium, published in Frankfort 1708, and frequently since; also a careful monograph, the *Historia Sacra Patriarcharum*, by J. Heinrich Heidegger, 2 vols. 4to, 2d ed., Amsterdam 1688. From the Lutheran Church, the *Historia Ecclesiastica V. T.* of the excellent theologian Buddeus, published in Halle 1715, 4to, 3d ed., and in the same place, in 2 vols., 1726, 1729. This may be regarded as the most important book of the period, which does not however imply that the author made deeper investigations than all others—in the *Compendium* of Vitringa there is more independent research than in his copious work—but only that no other work is better calculated to represent this period; a characteristic which it owes in part to the circumstance that the author disclaims all attempts at independence and originality. Buddeus is in general neither an actual inquirer nor a compiler, but an eclectic. Here we find the older material for a history of the Old Testament put together with great completeness. With diligence, circumspection, and sound judgment, the author has employed the sources and helps available in his day; elaborating, and everywhere expressly citing, his authorities. The order is luminous, the language good and fluent, and the whole, notwithstanding the total avoidance of everything ascetic, is penetrated by the spirit of piety. The *Collegium Historiae Eccles. V. T.*, by Joh. Jac. Rambach, edited after his death by Neubauer, Frankfort 1737, has no scientific value, but in this respect rests principally upon Buddeus; on the commentaries of Clericus, which contribute much that is useful for Old Testament history, although the author in

Theologics is very superficial; and on some other works. It is however distinguished by a treasure of excellent practical remarks; and is therefore always valuable, especially for the prospective clergyman. On the other hand, the works of Joachim Lange on the same subject, *Mosaic Light and Truth*, etc., which were much read in their day, are now of little use; owing to their prolixity, and deficiency in independent research. Lange possessed the power of writing seven sheets in a day, without exertion.

Let us now point out the general character of this period, and in so doing we must naturally notice only the comparatively better writers belonging to it. As in every department of theology, so here also, this period is distinguished by firmness of faith, by its absolute acceptance of divine revelation, and its unconditional submission to the divine word; by a conscientiousness in research, which has its root in this cardinal virtue; and by a diligence and a thoroughness proportioned to the prevailing view of the importance of the subject. But on the other hand, there are also unmistakeable defects; so that even the best works of the period no longer suffice for ours, even apart from the fact that the representation of the truth now demands distinct reference to error in that form in which it appears at variance with the truth; and the progress of recent times, especially in the history of antiquity, for which so many new sources have been discovered, and to which so many noble powers have been devoted, must also afford considerable gain for Old Testament history. Ancient writers of church histories of the Old Testament speak too much from a doctrinal point of view; so that we cannot expect from them a perfectly satisfactory representation of the divine institutions of salvation adapted to the condition of men. The *πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ* is concealed from them, Eph. iii. 10; they do not understand the *πολυτρόπως* in Heb. i. 1; the astonishing development from the germ to the fruit is hidden from their sight. They are wanting in that principle which ought to govern the presentation of the whole religious history of the Old Testament, insight into the divine condescension. In the unity of the two testaments they forget the diversity. Thus, for example, they seek to prove that the patriarchs already possessed a perfect knowledge of Christian truths in

their full extent, or at least with only a slight difference in clearness ; and attribute to the believers of the Old Testament a clear knowledge of the mystery of the Trinity, of the atoning sufferings of Christ, and of everlasting life, forcibly setting aside those passages which represent the future life as more or less concealed. Their prevailing intellectual tendency deprives them of the power of transference to ancient times ; they are deficient, like all their contemporaries, in historical intuition. This deficiency appears most strikingly in the representation of false religions, to which nearly all church histories of the Old Testament have devoted a special section. What they have contributed in this department, is now almost entirely useless. The heathen consciousness remained almost closed to the authors of these works,—a want which is not indeed peculiar to them, but is characteristic of the whole period. The origin of a symbolism and mythology really deserving of the name is due to our century. To Creuzer belongs the merit of having led the way in this department.

To the second subdivision of the first class belong, first, those who have treated Old Testament history with special reference to chronology. The most important among them are the more worthy of mention, since we are almost entirely dependent on their works : knowledge of this kind has made very little advance. And here we must in many respects assign the first place to the *Annales V. et N. T.* of the pious and learned Irish archbishop Usher, first published in London 1650, 1654, 2 vols. fol., afterwards in many impressions,—a work of long and arduous diligence, which opened a pathway in this department, and even now deserves attentive notice. A worthy parallel to it has been contributed by the Jesuit Petavius, *De Doctrina Temporum*, Antwerp 1703, 3 vols.—a more comprehensive work, in which, however, the biblical chronology is treated with peculiar diligence, with great acuteness, and much care, and on the whole in a clear, unprejudiced spirit. We must also draw attention to the *Chronologie de l'Histoire Sainte*, from the exodus from Egypt till the Babylonish captivity, by Alphonse de Vignoles, Berlin 1738, 2 vols. 4to, which deserves to be mentioned with distinction. The most recent solid work in this department is Hartmann's *Systema Chronologiae Biblicae*, Rostock 1777, 4to, which deserves to take

precedence of all others as a handbook of chronology, with Vitringa's summary.

Others made it their principal object to unite the biblical accounts with those of profane writers. The principal work of this kind is that of Prideaux, first published in English, London 1716, 1718, 2 vols., and again in this century in a new edition in England and America; in Germany, under the title *H. Prideaux A. und N. T. in Zusammenhang mit der Juden- und benachbarten Völker-Historie gebracht*, first published in Dresden 1721, two parts, 4to. The work begins with the time of Ahaz. For the period from the exile to Christ, it is still one of the most useful helps. The use of sources is extensive; and as an inquirer the author proves himself indefatigable. A want which is observable in almost every work of the kind, as well as in those of a prevailing theological character, is that of an able historical criticism. We find accounts of profane writers compared with the statements of holy Scripture, without regard to the condition of these authors, the degree of their credibility, or the sources from which they drew. Yet there were exceptions in this respect. Perizonius and Vitringa give evidence of decided critical talent; the latter especially is free alike from credulousness and from an unhealthy scepticism. We have testimony to his truly critical tendency, not only in his *Hypotyposis*, but also in his *Commentary on Isaiah*, and his *Observationes Sacrae*, which present much that is excellent for biblical history.

Let us now pass to the second class of helps to the history of the Old Testament, viz. the works of rationalistic authors. The direct advantage which these afford can only be small. That which we have designated the principal aim of the historian of the Old Testament, viz. the promotion of faith and love, cannot be realized by works of this kind. The history of the people of God becomes a history of human deceit and error in the hands of those who obliterated every trace of God from it. To discover this and to set it forth was for a long time a principal object. The first copious work is that by E. Lor. Bauer, *Manual of the History of the Hebrew Nation from its Origin to the Destruction of the State*, Nürnberg 1800, 1804, 2 vols. 8vo, incomplete, continued only to the time of the Babylonish exile. The chief strength of the author

consists in the natural explanation of miracles; he does not even make use of the most common sources and aids. De Wette, in the sketch of Jewish history in his *Compendium of Hebrew-Jewish Archaeology*, is too brief to do anything but set forth the view of the author and of those who agree with him respecting Hebrew history. The estimate to be put upon Leo's *Lectures on Jewish History* may be inferred from the circumstance that he makes it the principal aim of his undertaking to show from the example of the Hebrews what a people should not be. The author himself afterwards retracted his opinions, in the first volume of his *History of the World*. Ewald's work, *History of the People of Israel*, 3 vols., also belongs essentially to the rationalistic standpoint, notwithstanding all its high modes of speech. For here too the history of the people of Israel is treated throughout as a purely natural process of development. The book is out and out anthropocentric. This mode of treatment reaches its climax in the *History of Christ*, which appeared in the year 1854, nominally as the fourth volume of the *History of Israel*. Here Ewald himself states that it is one of his main objects to prove there was nothing in Christ which any one may not now attain. Where he differs from De Wette and his followers is in this, that while the latter confine themselves to destruction, Ewald always attempts to build up something new in the place of what has been destroyed. Many of his performances in this respect are however mere castles in the air; he is deficient not only in the mind for sacred history, but also in the historic sense generally. This is evident from the one circumstance that he regards Manetho as a historical source co-ordinate with the biblical writings. Here even more than in his later writings the author is in bondage to his subjectivity, so that he can no longer see simple things as they really are, but is constrained to make history. To this he adds tiresome length and prolixity. The gain which the book brings is limited to the impulse it affords, no small merit certainly; and to single correct apprehensions, luminous rays, which are not wanting in any of the works of Ewald, although they appear but rarely in his earliest writings. On account of these luminous points we cannot overlook his work. Thus rationalism has not contributed any important direct advance in Old Testament history.

Indirectly, however, rationalism has exercised a salutary influence on the history of the Old Testament. This may be clearly seen in the works of the Old Testament historians who continued to believe in revelation after the rise of rationalism. They happily avoid those errors which had been censured in authors of the first period. Doctrinal embarrassment has in a great measure ceased. The power of transferring themselves into antiquity is greatly increased. Careful consideration is bestowed on the gradual development of the divine institutions of salvation. On the other hand, we cannot fail to recognise the injurious influence of rationalism on many works of this period. From fear of giving offence—partly, too, from weakness of faith—some have attempted either by forced explanations entirely to do away with single miracles of the Old Testament, or at least to make very little of them. Thus an inconsistency appears, of which their opponents at once take advantage; comp., for example, the observations which Strauss makes on Steudel in the 1st Heft of the *Streitschriften*. Fearing lest they should go too far, or perhaps depending on the inquiry conducted by unbelief, they sometimes extinguish the light of the Old Testament when it is actually luminous; they strive unceasingly to forget all they have learnt from the New Testament, and to go back completely to the standpoint of those who lived under the Old Testament; they suffer themselves to be guided too much by apologetic attempts; and try to establish the plan of the divine institutions of salvation too surely and specially, in order by this means, by allowing nothing which is incomprehensible and inexplicable to stand, by pointing out an aim and meaning in everything, by proving the reference of each to the whole—to compel, as it were, their opponents to the acknowledgment of the divine elements in Old Testament history, a proceeding which could only attain its object if human nature were constituted otherwise than it really is. The most important works of this class are the following:—*History of the Israelites before the time of Jesus*, Zürich 1776–1788, 12 vols. 8vo, by Joh. Jac. Hess, with which we may connect the *Doctrine of the Kingdom of God*, 2 vols., by the same author; and Kern's *Doctrine of the Kingdom of God*, in which latter work,

that appeared in the year 1814, we have the author's performances *in nuce* and in their greatest ripeness. These have throughout a groundwork of learned research; although the author rather conceals than displays it. In respect of learning, however, they bear only a secondary character; and in the years which have passed since the appearance of the principal work, the study of history has received so great an impulse from the discovery of new sources, from the development of historical criticism, and from enlargement of the intellectual horizon, that in this respect they no longer suffice. We are somewhat shocked also by the wide and extended view they take, and to which we are not accustomed. Our time demands much in a small compass. The author gives himself too much trouble in elucidating the plan of God for the salvation of mankind. He often sacrifices depth to clearness. He grasps the idea of the divine condescension somewhat roughly at times—too much after the manner of Spencer. (J. Spencer wrote a work entitled *De Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus*, first published in 1686, in which he sought to derive the Old Testament ceremonial law from an accommodation of God to the heathenizing tendencies of the people: *ineptiæ tolerabiles*.) Hess does not make it sufficiently clear that it is God who condescends; and suggests that perhaps the Israelites merely drew Him down to them in their thoughts, as in the account which the author gives of Israelitish worship;—indeed, his whole view of the theocracy has a mixture of bad anthropomorphism; and if it had been conformable to Scripture, it would have thrown doubt on the divine origin of this institution. The tendency of the author, moreover, is too purely historical; he is less able to comprehend the doctrinal contents of the Old Testament. Yet all this does not prevent his work from belonging to the most important which have been written on the history of the Old Testament; and the author's standpoint appears the more worthy of honour, the more we take into consideration the time in which and for which he wrote. The book has exercised a very considerable influence. Many have been preserved by it in a time of apostasy; or have been led back into the right way. In Count Stolberg's well-known *History of the Religion of Jesus Christ*, the first four volumes treat of the history of the creation of the

world till the birth of Christ. We find scarcely a trace of the influence of rationalism in this work. It is lively and suggestive, only written in somewhat too pretentious language, with spirit and with deep piety. Sometimes, however, the author introduces the dogmas of his church; and, from a learned point of view, the work has very important defects, or, more correctly speaking, is almost without excellence. Ignorant of the Hebrew language, the author, in his exposition of the Old Testament, has almost throughout been obliged to follow absolutely the somewhat antiquated and rather shallow works of the French Benedictine, Calmet; a cognate spirit to Grotius and Le Clerc. The mistakes of the works of the first period, especially the mingling of the later with the earlier, here return; the author has made pretty extensive use of foreign sources and aids for Hebrew history, especially for the history of false religions, which he has copiously treated, but has used them in a manner which is truly Roman Catholic, without criticism or sifting, and with too ready an acceptance of that which serves his aim. This is exemplified in the supplements to his first volume, *On the Sources of Eastern Tradition*, and *Traces of Earlier Tradition respecting the Mysteries of the Religion of Jesus Christ*. Here we altogether lose sight of the former Protestant; while his ever-recurring subjectivity is manifestly a beautiful dowry he has taken with him from the Evangelical Church. For the clergyman who knows how to test it, the book remains still useful in many respects. Zahn's work, *On the Kingdom of God*, is also worthy of notice. It was published in Dresden in 1830, and afterwards in a second and third edition, but remained almost unchanged. The first volume embraces the Old Testament; the second, the history of Christ; the third proposes to give the history of the Christian Church. In a scientific point of view it is only second-rate; in separate learned researches the author mostly follows either an earlier or a later guide. But the style is lively, vigorous, and full of spirit; the author has made suitable choice of a considerable number of excellent passages on Old Testament history from Christian authors of every century; everywhere we find firmness of faith without doctrinal embarrassment. Yet the book is very unequally worked out, and becomes more and more meagre as the author proceeds. Kurtz's *Compendium*

of *Biblical History* found acceptance among many; and though properly designed only for the highest class of schools, it presents a diligent and comprehensive use of existing helps. Of the larger work by the same author only two volumes have yet appeared, containing the time of the Pentateuch. The author has amassed materials with great diligence; and in many respects his work promises to be for our time what Buddeus's was for his. There is a want, however, of thorough research and sharp criticism; especially of a simple historical sense. The author too frequently gives himself up without investigation to the influence of the work of v. Hofmann, *Prophecy and Fulfilment*, which, with a spiritual tendency, is excellently adapted to give suggestions, but against the results of which we must be on our guard; for in many cases they are not the product of a genuine historical view, but rather of history-making. He also adheres too closely to Baumgarten's *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, a work which contains much that is immature and fantastic; and fails to control Delitzsch's *Commentary on Genesis* with sufficient sharpness. It is a lamentable phenomenon that the simple and the natural are so little apprehended. In this respect many an ecclesiastically-minded author might have learned even from a Gesenius. The *principiis obsta* holds good here; for whoever once enters on this course can hardly leave it again. It is of special importance, therefore, to begin betimes to walk in the footsteps of men who, like the Reformers, Joh. Gerhard, Bengel, and Vitringa, are fundamentally opposed to such far-fetched spiritual subtleties, and whose aim it was, not to say something new but true. *The History of the Old Testament*, Leipzig 1863, by Hasse, who died in the year 1862, Professor of Theology in Bonn, is an excellent little book. It is written in a truly historic sense, in clear and simple language, and is well adapted to furnish a preliminary survey. The performances of recent times are also of some importance for the religious history of the Old Testament, especially Steudel's *Lectures on the Theology of the Old Testament*, edited by Oehler, Berlin 1840, which, as a whole, belongs too exclusively to a transition period, and to the supernaturalistic standpoint, to be able to afford much satisfaction, but has in detail much that is able; and the *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, by Bähr, Heidelberg 1837, 1839, to which,

however often we may differ from the author, we cannot deny the great merit of having given a powerful impulse to the weighty subject, and of having introduced it once more into the circle of theological treatises. Hävernicks *Lectures on the Theology of the Old Testament*, published after the author's death, have little depth; but are well calculated to afford the first survey. V. Hofmann's *Schriftbeweis* is only for the more advanced and mature; the thorough and able examination of Kliefoth serves to correct him in his numerous aberrations.

FIRST PERIOD.

FROM ABRAHAM TO MOSES.

§ 1.

THE CONDITION OF THE HUMAN RACE AT THE TIME OF ABRAHAM'S CALL.

1. *In a Political Aspect.*



AFTER the flood the population increased with rapid strides. The long duration of life, a powerful constitution, and the ease with which all the necessities of life could be procured, all tended to promote an increase much more rapid than what was common to later times.

The population of the earth, according to Genesis xi., first proceeded from Shinar or Babylonia, the most southern part of the region between the Euphrates and the Tigris, beyond Mesopotamia, a plain with rich soil, the most fruitful land of interior Asia. Thither the descendants of Noah repaired after the flood, and there they dwelt, still connected by community of tongue and unity of mind, until with the latter the former also gradually disappeared, and everything was dispersed on every side. With respect to the manner of life of the first race of men, a hypothesis has frequently been suggested that men without exception passed through the various stages of uncivilised life until they arrived at agriculture. But this hypothesis, which rests on no historical basis, is contradicted by history. According to the account given in Genesis, agriculture is as old and original as the pastoral life; and if it existed before the flood, it is impossible to see how the descendants of these shepherds should have been

obliged to rise to it again step by step. Of Noah it is expressly stated that he devoted himself to agriculture, and especially to the cultivation of the vine. And, moreover, in the countries of Asia and Africa, where agriculture was exceptionally flourishing, especially in Egypt and Babylonia, we are altogether unable to trace its origin. "So far as history and tradition reach," says Schlosser in his *General Historic Survey of the History of the Ancient World*, part i. p. 39, "we find those kinds of grass which have been improved by culture already cultivated as kinds of grain; and their wild state, as well as their proper home, can only be matter of conjecture," which is also the case with the original species and home of the domestic animals. The zoologist, A. Wagner, in his *History of the Primitive World*, has shown that we are acquainted with no wild stock of all our domestic animals, especially of the cow, the sheep, the goat, the horse, the camel, and the dog; but at most only with individuals who have become wild. He proves also that the time of their introduction into the domestic state cannot be determined; and that a new stock has not been added to the old in the course of time. "The help of those domestic animals," he remarks, "without which a higher state of cultivation cannot exist, seems therefore not to have been devised and attained by man, but rather to have been originally given to him." The botanist, Zuccarini, remarks, "In answer to the question, 'What man reaped the first harvest?' we have no tradition to which any probability attaches, no monument; but still, so far as we know, no blade growing wild." According to this, therefore, there was from the beginning not a succession but a co-existence of the various modes of life. In the case of each individual race and people, the choice was partly determined by its character, which was to a great extent moulded by the individuality of its ancestors (we have remarkable examples of this in Ishmael and Esau); but still more strongly and permanently by the nature of the residence allotted to each. A land, such as Egypt for example, where the whole natural condition was an incentive to agriculture, which so richly rewarded a little labour, must by degrees have led its inhabitants to this pursuit, even if in accordance with their disposition they had originally more inclination for some other mode of life. The great wastes of Mesopotamia would have

compelled a race, which had by any circumstance been led to immigrate thither, to embrace a nomadic life, even if it had formerly been given to agriculture. Districts like those at Astaboras in Ethiopia make agriculture and cattle-rearing so impracticable, that for thousands of years their inhabitants have remained hunters, without having made the least step towards a higher civilisation, although surrounded by cultivated nations. And just as the mode of life adopted by races and peoples was dependent on the character of the soil and the climate; so these, in conjunction with the manner of life and ethical development, gave rise to great diversities among the nations of the earth, so great that many have been led by observation, in contradiction to the Old and New Testament Scriptures, to deny the descent from one human pair, and to maintain an essential difference of races. This hypothesis is contradicted by the fact, not to mention other reasons, that among those nations whose descent from one and the same stock cannot be denied, there are almost as great differences as among those to which different stems have been assigned. This is the case especially among the African peoples. Nowhere is the influence of climate and manner of life more perceptible than among them. "The inhabitants of the northern coast," says Heeren, "in complexion and form differ very little from Europeans. The difference appears to become more and more marked the nearer we approach the equator; the colour becomes darker; the hair more like wool; the profile shows striking differences; finally the man becomes completely a negro. Again, on the other side of the equator, this form appears to be lost amid just as many varieties; the Kaffirs and Hottentots have much in common with the negroes, but without being completely negroes." We must consider further, that the influence of climatic and other conditions is still retained among those who settle in other latitudes in modern times, where the peculiarities are much more strongly defined than in the softer and more pliant primitive times, and which therefore possess a much stronger power of resistance. Bishop Heber speaks thus of the Persians, Tartars, and Turks who had penetrated into Hindoostan, part i. p. 217 of the translation of his *Life*, "It is remarkable how all these people after a few generations, even without intermixing with the Hindoos,

acquire the deep olive tint almost like a negro, which therefore seems peculiar to the climate. The Portuguese intermarry only among themselves; or, if they can, with Europeans; but these very Portuguese have become as black after the lapse of three centuries' residence in Africa as the Kaffirs. If the heat has power to originate a difference, it is possible that other peculiarities of the climate may give rise to other differences; and allowing these to have operated from three to four thousand years, it becomes very difficult to determine the limits of their efficacy." Finally, we must take into consideration the analogy of the changes in the animal world in various localities. "All national varieties," says Blumenbach, "in the form and complexion of the human body are in no wise more striking or more incomprehensible than those into which so many other species of organized bodies, especially among domestic animals, degenerate under our eyes." R. Wagner, a successor of Blumenbach, gives expression to the same sentiment in his work *Menschenchöpfung und Seelensubstanz*, p. 17, which appeared in Göttingen in 1854: "The possibility of descent from one pair cannot be scientifically contested in accordance with physiological principles. In separate colonized countries we see among men and beasts peculiarities arise and become permanent, which reminds us, though remotely, of the formation of races." Compare the ample refutation of the hypothesis of a number of primitive men in the first volume of Humboldt's *Kosmos*; in R. Wagner's *Anthropologie*, 2d vol., Kempten 1834, p. 102 *et seq.*; in Tholuck's Essay, *Was ist das Resultat der Wissenschaft in Bezug auf die Urwelt*, verm. Schriften, Th. 2, p. 239 *et seq.*; and in the second part of A. Wagner's *Urgeschichte der Erde*; also in a work by Schultz, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte*, Gotha 1865. All these, together with others, draw attention to the fact that there are black Jews in Asia; that the negroes of the United States in the course of a hundred and fifty years have travelled over a good quarter of the distance which separates them from the white men; that America has changed the Anglo-Saxon type, and from the English race has derived a new white race, which may be called the Yankee race; that the Arabs in Nubia have become perfectly black; and that when we hear a Dyak who has been rescued from barbarism, or a poor Hottentot maiden speak gratefully of that which Jesus has done for

them, we are unable to divest ourselves of the feeling that here is flesh of our flesh. Lange, in his *Dogm.* ii. p. 332 *et seq.*, shows that diversities are not however to be attributed to climatic influences alone. We must not overlook the fact that the germs of the various types of the human race must have been in existence from the beginning; and that climatic influences and a different mode of education have only developed these germs. Ungewitter, in his *Introduction to the Geography of Australia*, which appeared in the year 1853, makes some striking observations on the influence of a different moral development. And the greater or less culture of the people was closely connected with their mode of life. Culture was already considerably advanced before the flood. Judging from what revelation tells us of the condition of the first man, it could not be otherwise. Among those nations who, by the character of their lands, were led to agriculture and commerce, the original culture was not only retained, but continued to advance; so it was, for example, in Egypt and Phœnicia. Among the hunting and shepherd peoples, on the contrary, original culture must soon have been lost had it not been that, as Abraham's stock, they had a special capacity for civilisation, and dwelt in the midst of agricultural nations; otherwise they must have fallen back into complete barbarism. The perception of this has led many to adopt the hypothesis already refuted, viz. that the original condition of humanity has in general been one closely resembling that of the animals. There are numerous arguments subversive of this view. We shall only quote here what Link says in his *Urwelt und das Alterthum*. 2d ed. part i. p. 346: "It is a remarkable phenomenon that neither in antiquity nor in modern times has any nation been found which, according to credible witnesses, does not possess the knowledge of fire, and of the means of producing it, although many nations are now known whose ability to discover fire we may reasonably question. It is highly probable therefore that all nations sprang from one stem, and that savage nations have fallen, if not from a high, at least from a higher cultivation. In some cases we are able to prove certainly that wildness is only degeneracy. Among American savages the language has been found to resemble that of the Japanese in many points; and therefore it has been supposed that they are descended

from shipwrecked Japanese. Among this race culture must have been very readily lost; for they are altogether unproductive, only imitative. Whoever stepped out of the intercourse of nations lost his prototypes, and at the same time his position. Aristotle calls man a *ζῶον πολιτικόν*. The formation of states is not the work of man." "An incessant impulse," says Leo, "is at work in man, a magnetic cord draws him to the formation of such communities; he is created for them, and therefore these communities themselves are a part of the human creation; they have not been invented by man, but were born with him. The beginning of civil government was various among the various nations. It has at least a double origin. That which in a good sense was conformable to nature, was the development of civil government out of the family. The head of the family by the increase of the family becomes head of the race; his government, which passes on from him to his eldest son, and reaches beyond the family circle to his household, and to those who have repaired to him for protection, forms an analogy to the paternal sway." We have an example of this kind of government in the history of the patriarchs; and also in the glimpses of the history of the Edomites given in Gen. xxxvi. But an actual state is formed only in those kingdoms where there is not only a natural factor, but also a moral one; where a moral idea forms the centre of a natural union of peoples. This alone can permanently preserve a nation from decay. This alone can supply true religion in its most perfect sense. It was by the apprehension of this that Israel first attained to the full dignity of a nation; which it could never have gained by mere carnal descent from Abraham. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were not only its carnal, but also its spiritual ancestors, whose work was continued by Moses. Under him they first adopted those high truths which became the centre of national life. The heathen nations are, in Deut. xxxii., said to be not a people, because they did not possess this animating principle. Even among Israel, those only were regarded as true members of the nation who participated in this spirit; of the rest it is said in the law, that soul shall be rooted out from the nation; and John says in the Apocalypse of the great mass of the nations who assumed the name of Jews, "They say they are Jews, and

are not." So Paul in Rom. ii. 28, 29. Whoever in this spirit attached himself to the community of nations was looked upon as a true member of it, though he might not possess the sign of actual descent. We find another form of government exemplified in the history of Nimrod. It has its origin in power; and rests upon the so-called right of the stronger, which, when combined with the passion for possession and dominion, raises the possessor to the rule over those who have not enough strength and energy to oppose his usurpation; and therefore destroys the natural form of government, or only suffers it to exist in a subordinate relation, which is usual in the ancient East.

After these observations it is incumbent on us to treat of the separate nations which were already in existence at the time when Abraham appeared, and came into contact with him or his posterity. How necessary this sketch is for understanding all subsequent history is self-evident; and we have also the example of Moses, who, before passing on to the history of Abraham, gives a genealogic-historical survey of the national ancestry, with special reference to their connection with the history of the chosen people.

We begin here with the country which we have already termed the second cradle of the human race, as that from which the dispersion of men after the flood over the whole earth went forth, viz. the territory of Babylonia, so important for the later history of the East generally, and for that of the Israelites in particular. Here was the site of the city Babylon, which did not attain that greatness which its ruins now attest till many centuries later,—in the time of the Chaldaic supremacy, and especially under Nebuchadnezzar. It was overthrown by the combined strength of the tribes who united for this undertaking, forming a kind of confederate state. Not long afterwards other towns, also worthy of mention, were founded. It was here that in all probability, soon after the dispersion of the races, one of those who had remained, a member of the Hamitic tribe of the Cushites, founded a despotic government. He undertook a conquering foray from a distant land; and after-time, in accordance with the Oriental custom, gave him from the beginning the name of Nimrod, rebel, viz. against the order of God,—נִמְרוֹד signifies

properly, "we will rebel;" he himself made use of these insolent words; they were his motto, and therefore well adapted for his proper name. Besides Babylon, Nimrod took other towns in the district of Shinar. But not content with this extension of his kingdom, he undertook a campaign from Babylon into the neighbouring district of Assyria, situated on the other side of the Tigris, the country east of the Tigris (between Susiana and Elymais, Media and Armenia). The 11th verse is not to be translated as Michaelis and others have it, "Out of that land went forth Asshur, and builded Nineveh," etc.; but, "From this land he went out towards Asshur, and builded Nineveh, Rehoboth, Ur, Calah, and the greatest among all, Resen, between Nineveh and Calah," as may be seen from this fact, among others, viz. that in the former verse the cities of Babylonia are said to be the beginning of the kingdom of Nimrod; and also because Assyria is by Micah called the land of Nimrod; and moreover the mention of a march of the Shemite Asshur would be out of place here, where Moses is occupied with the descendants of Ham. In all probability the steppe-land of Assyria was at that time already in the possession of the Semitic, nomad tribe of Asshur. After having conquered it, Nimrod founded several cities with the view of establishing his supremacy; for a supremacy over nomads cannot be otherwise than fluctuating and evanescent. Layard and others have put forward the opinion that the towns named formed separate parts of a great city, parts of Nineveh in a wide sense. Moreover, among the Arabs and Persians, Nimrod is the subject of ancient and widely-spread traditions; he bears among them the name of the scoffer and the godless (comp. the collections of Herbelot, *Bibl. Oriental*, s. v. *Dahak*, and in Michaelis, *Supplem.* p. 1321). Yet these traditions are not a branch of ancient tradition independent of the Hebrew, but only embellishment of what had passed over from the Jews to the other nations of the East. Far more importance is due to the confirmation which this account of a Hamitic colony receives from the many traces which have been discovered of a connection between Hamitic Egypt and Babylonia in religion and culture; comp. Leo, p. 165. The kingdom of Nimrod was not of long duration; already in Abraham's time it had quite lost its importance. This appears from the narra-

tive of the battles of the kings of Interior Asia against the kings in the plain of Siddim. It is true that here also we have mention of Amraphel, king of Shinar. But in verses 4 and 5 Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, appears as the originator of the whole expedition, to whom Amraphel and the other kings stood in a subordinate relation. Elam was the Elymais of the Greeks and Romans, and was bordered by Persia on the east, on the west by Babylonia, on the north by Media, and on the south by the Persian Gulf. This kingdom seems to have been the most powerful in Interior Asia at the time of Abraham. Yet the wide difference between it and the later larger Asiatic kingdom, a result of the smallness of the population at that time spread over the earth, appears most plainly from the fact that the king, although with his allies he undertook a campaign into distant Palestine, was yet unable to withstand the comparatively weak power of Abraham and his confederates. But in the interval between Abraham and Moses an important Assyrian monarchy must have been formed. This appears from Gen. ii. 14, according to which the Tigris flowed on the east of Assyria. For this presupposes that at the time of Moses an Assyrian monarchy existed, of which that part which lay on the west of the Tigris was so important that the eastern portion was as nothing compared with it. For to Assyria proper the Tigris is not east but west. In harmony with this are the native traditions of the Assyrians, which have become known to us through the medium of classical authors, the traditions of Semiramis and Ninus; at the basis of which there must, at least, be this much historical truth, that already in primitive times a powerful Assyrian kingdom was in existence. This is borne out by the testimony of Egyptian monuments; upon which we find the Assyrians, then called Schari, engaged in war with the Egyptians, even in very early times; comp. *d. Bb. Moses in Æg.* p. 209; *Bileam*, p. 260 *et seq.* Birch has recently tried to prove that the Schari are identical with the Syrians. But it is evident that this name is only of late origin, and was corrupted from Assyria after the time of the Assyrian supremacy over Aram. In the interval between Moses and the period of the Israelitish kings, the kingdom of Assyria appears again to have fallen into decay. But in the days of Uzziah it began once more to rise up victorious; and became a scourge in

the hand of the Lord against His faithless people, as Balaam had already prophesied.

Mesopotamia, the northern portion of the land between the Euphrates and the Tigris, bounded on the south by Babylonia and on the north by Armenia, was already in the time of Abraham, as it is still, overrun with nomadic tribes, for whom by its natural character it is specially adapted;—it is in the interior a steppe-land. Here the ancestors of Abraham settled down; hence Abraham began his wanderings; and here his kindred continued to sojourn. That the original inhabitants of Mesopotamia were the Chaldæans is evident from the name Ur Chasdim, the present Urfa in the north of Hatra; comp. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, x. 3, pp. 159, 243; as also from Job i. 17, where from Mesopotamia they make an incursion into the neighbouring Uz. The Chaldæans were at home not only in Mesopotamia, but in Babylonia. They were of Semitic origin and tongue. Yet, like the Assyrians, they must have been considerably influenced by the neighbouring Indo-Persian races, as appears from the names of their kings and gods. It is a remarkable fact that the Chaldæans are not named in the table of nations; but because Ur Chasdim had already appeared in the history of Abraham, we must expect to find them here disguised under some other name. The most probable hypothesis is that they were descended from Arphaxad, who is mentioned in Gen. x. 22, together with Elam and Asshur, among the descendants of Shem. This is the opinion of Josephus. How to interpret the prefixed אַר is uncertain.

We now pass on to that part of western South Asia which is situated on this side of the Euphrates; and since we possess no information relative to the political condition of Syria at the time of Abraham, we must pass at the same time to Palestine. This country was at that time inhabited by two different races. The principal one, of which we must speak at greater length on account of its exceptional importance in the whole history of the Old Testament, was that of the Canaanites, or according to their Greek name, the Phœnicians. And here we must first examine into the correctness of the view which has become pretty widely extended since the argument of Michaelis, and has recently been defended by Bertheau in his *History of the Israelites*, Göttingen 1842, and by Ewald and Kurtz, viz.

that the Canaanites originally dwelt on the Persian Gulf, and only settled in Palestine at a later time. The advocates of this view appeal to two arguments : (1.) To the testimony of several ancient authors, who expressly say that the Phœnicians came from the Persian Gulf or from the Red Sea. But on nearer consideration these witnesses lose much of their value. Only Herodotus and Strabo are independent. Herodotus, who lived for a long time in Tyre, in the principal passage, chap. i. 1, designates not the Phœnicians, but the Persians, as the originators of this account. But how could this, a new nation, that is to say, one which did not awake to historical consciousness until a comparatively late period, know anything more definite respecting the origin of the Phœnicians than they themselves? and they regarded themselves as Autochthons. But these witnesses refer principally to a time to which the heathen consciousness did not extend, so that we cannot sufficiently wonder at the uncritical procedure which treats them with as much respect as if they referred to some fact in historical times. Their testimony loses still more of its value when we examine the probable sources of their accounts; and we are able to do this with the greater certainty since the authors themselves give us some information respecting these sources. In some passages Strabo expressly says that the doubtful assumption of some, that the Phœnicians originally came from the Red Sea (to which the Persian Gulf also belongs), is founded on the names of the islands Tylus and Aradus, which have been combined with the names of the cities, Tyre and Aradus. A second source quoted, both by Strabo and others, was the name Phœnicians. "It has been assumed," says Strabo, "that they are called Phœnicians, because the sea is termed Red." These two sources fully suffice to explain the origin of this opinion, especially as all later accounts are dependent on those of Herodotus and Strabo. (2.) Michaelis tries to prove, even from Scripture, from Gen. xii. 16, xiii. 7, that the Canaanites were a people who only immigrated at a later time. For there it is said that the Canaanites were *already* in the land at the time of Abraham. But this proof is based on an evidently false interpretation of these passages : the *already* is introduced. We are told, merely by way of illustrating the relations of Abraham, that the land was not empty on his arrival, but was

in the possession of the Canaanites, so that he was obliged to dwell there as a stranger, and could not call a foot-breadth of it his own. The opinion that the Phœnicians originally dwelt on the Red Sea has therefore no argument of any weight in its favour. On the contrary, it is at variance with the account given in Genesis, according to which the Canaanites appear as the original inhabitants of their land; no other races are mentioned as having been found there and expelled by them, as was the case with the Philistines, Idumæans, and Moabites. Bertheau and Ewald have indeed adopted this view; but the races which they state to have been dispossessed were themselves of Canaanitish origin. It is evident from Deut. iii. 8, iv. 47, xxxi. 4, that the Rephites belonged to the Canaanites; and it is impossible to separate the race of giants who dwelt in Canaan from the Canaanites, for it was only the territory of the Canaanites which was given by God to the Israelites, and they were careful to avoid every encroachment on other boundaries. Moreover, the giants in Canaan are in Amos ii. 9 (comp. with Num. xiii. 32, 33) expressly called Canaanites. That the Horites, whom Ewald also classes among the original nations, were Canaanites, will appear afterwards. (Compare the copious refutation of the hypothesis of Ewald and Bertheau in the treatise by Kurtz, *Die Ureinwohner Palästinas*, Guerike's *Zeitschrift*, 1845, 3 Heft.) In the whole table of nations, which is so exceedingly ample and accurate where the Canaanites are concerned, we find no mention whatever of original inhabitants dispossessed by the Canaanites. And further, it is related in chap. x. 18, 19, how the Canaanites spread themselves over the land as their tribes increased by degrees from a few members to considerable nationalities. This leads us to infer that they found the land empty and at their service. In chap. x. 15 the personified Sidon is called the first-born of Canaan; therefore it has been said that Sidon was the oldest settlement of the Canaanites; and since it is one of the most northern states, this points to an emigration from Babylonia through Mesopotamia and Syria, which is rendered more probable by the analogy of Abraham's wandering, that also took a north-easterly direction. If the immigration had been from Arabia, the southern settlements must have been the earliest.

The extent of the land of Canaan is given in Gen. x. 19. It reached from Sidon to Gerar, as far as Gaza, thence to Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim, as far as Lasha. Sidon is here termed the northern boundary, because there was at this time no Phœnician town of any importance above it, except Hamath in Syria; although the Phœnicians still occupied the narrow space between the sea and Lebanon, as far as the Syrian boundary. The south-western and southern boundary appears to have been formed by the Philistine towns Gerar and Gaza; the south-eastern limit of the land being the cities in the fruitful plain, which were afterwards covered by the Dead Sea. The eastern boundary, Lasha, is uncertain; according to Jerome, it is the later Callirrhoe on the eastern side of the Dead Sea, noted for its warm baths. The most important tribes of the Canaanites were the Amorites and the Hittites: hence the nation is often called by their name, particularly by that of the former. Ewald is mistaken in his recent attempt to maintain that the Canaanites also were originally only a single, separate, powerful branch of the nation, and that their name was afterwards transferred to the whole nation, whose real name has been lost. The only passage, Num. xiii. 29, which is brought forward in favour of this assumption does not prove it. "The Amalekites dwell in the land of the south; and the Hittites, and the Jebusites, and the Amorites, dwell in the mountains; and the Canaanites dwell by the sea." As for the dwellers beside the sea, writers have contented themselves with giving the general name of the people, either because they were ignorant of the more accurate one, or because it had no special interest at the time. At first the Israelites had intercourse only with those who dwelt in the southern range of mountains. There is just as little foundation for Ewald's assumption that all Canaanitish nationalities were included in the four great divisions of the Amorites, Hittites, Canaanites, and Hivites. There is not a single proof that the remaining nationalities stood in a subordinate relation to these.

The Canaanites were at that time an agricultural and commercial people. Commerce is first mentioned in Scripture in Gen. xlix. 13, in the blessing of Jacob, where it is spoken of as a privilege conferred on Zebulun, or properly on Israel; for in Zebulun is only exemplified that which belongs to the

whole—he is to dwell on the shores of the sea, in the neighbourhood of Sidon, that he may have opportunity for profitable trade. But at that time commerce could only have been in its first beginning; for those great Asiatic kingdoms with which the Phœnicians were afterwards connected in so many ways were not yet in existence; most of the lands bordering on the sea were still occupied by nomads who could offer no great commercial advantage. Navigation was still in its infancy, although the situation of the Phœnician towns was so favourable to commerce by sea; and notwithstanding the excellence of the materials which their country offered for shipbuilding. At that time, and for long afterwards, Sidon was the principal city of the country. Tyre, although it had probably been founded already, is not once mentioned in the Pentateuch. It first appears in Josh. xix. 29. Even in Abraham's time we find the land far from being occupied by the number of Canaanites which it could bear. The Canaanites willingly yielded to Abraham the use of large districts. He was at liberty to traverse the whole land; and everywhere found sustenance for his flocks. We can form a pretty correct idea of the gradual growth of the population. Jacob and Esau have no longer room in the land for their flocks, which together were certainly not more numerous than those of Abraham. Esau therefore repairs to Mount Seir, afterwards Idumea. On the return of the Hebrews from Egypt the land was already almost overfilled with inhabitants. The constitution of the Canaanites was at the time of Abraham essentially the same as in later times. Compare the description of the latter by Heeren, i. 2, p. 14 *et seq.* The land was divided into a number of cities with their townships, of which each had an independent king. Thus, for example, we find in Genesis kings of the separate cities in the region of what was afterwards the Dead Sea; a king of Salem, afterwards Jerusalem, the dwelling-place of the Jebusites; a king of Sichem, etc. Then, as in later times, the kings sought to obviate the injurious effect of this dismemberment by mutual covenants to submit to the guidance of the most powerful. Thus the kings of the vale of Siddim united against their common enemies from Interior Asia. Then the seat of government was at Sodom; as among the Canaanites dwelling on the sea the seat of government was

originally at Sidon, afterwards at Tyre. In primitive, as in late times, the power of the kings was limited. We infer this principally from the negotiations of the prince of Sichem with his subjects, in Gen. xxxiv. Despotism was kept down by civilisation, which had early been promoted by agriculture and commerce; and we find them already considerably advanced in Genesis. It appears also, that in some cities an aristocratic or democratic constitution existed. Among the Hittites at Hebron, according to Gen. xxiii., the highest power seems to have rested with an assembly of the people. In later time we find a similar constitution in the city of Gibeon, comp. Josh. ix. Their elders and kings decided everything. And in the list of Canaanitish kings conquered by Joshua, Josh. xii., there is no mention of a king of Gibeon. The influence of the priesthood, which was afterwards so powerful, seems not yet to have been in existence, if we may judge from the history of Melchizedek and from the complete silence respecting the priesthood elsewhere. Among the Canaanites it existed from the beginning in a corrupt root of sin. They were a reprobate people. This appears from Gen. ix. 25, where, on account of the sin of Ham, Canaan his son is cursed, for no other reason than because of the foreknowledge that Ham's sin would be perpetuated, especially in Canaan and his race. Already, in Abraham's time, the day was at hand when the iniquity of the Amorites should be full, Gen. xv. 16; when it should have reached the highest point which infallibly draws down avenging justice. This deep corruption of the Canaanites, to which testimony is borne by classical writers, forms one of the presuppositions in favour of the decrees of God with respect to the guidance of His people. Ezekiel, in chap. xxviii., foretells that the spirit of commerce would overgrow all nobler feelings, and thus become a snare to them. And it is observable that the Canaanites, although of Hamitic origin, must in early times have been in close contact with Semitic races. We are led to this conclusion by the fact that their language belongs to the Semitic stock; but the inference that the Canaanites must therefore necessarily have been a branch of the Semitic stock has been arrived at too hastily. And yet the circumstance cannot be explained, as some old authors have attempted, by the fact that the Canaanites adopted their

language from the patriarchs. We are so little acquainted with the associations of races in the primitive world, where the small number of members made it so easy for language to pass from one to the other, that mere community of language has not power to destroy the weight of express reiterated testimony, contained in a document whose credibility has proved itself even to those who are accustomed to regard it only as human testimony. We have, moreover, on our side the analogy of the very important Semitic element in the language of the Egyptians, which also can only have been derived from close intercourse with Semitic races in primitive times. But analogies lead us still further. Leo, p. 109, points out that in the lapse of time almost all the Hamites have lost their language; and it is certain that they have all been supplanted by Semitic dialects, as Arabic is now the prevailing language in Egypt. He attributes this to the circumstance that among the Hamitic nations there was a special inclination towards the external side of life,—thus, in the Old Testament, Canaanite and merchant are convertible terms,—and for this reason a want of attraction towards the inner, deeper sides of spiritual life. Among such nations language is something extraneous, which is readily relinquished. “If we knew the Semitic dialect of Canaan better,” Leo goes on to say, “we should be sure to find in its character evidences of the presence of Hamitic modes of thought, and should find it to be a kind of low Hebrew.”

From the Canaanites we pass on to their neighbours the Philistines, the inhabitants of the southern coast of Palestine, reaching from Egypt to Ekron, almost opposite Jerusalem. From the statement of Genesis, that the territory of the Canaanites extended as far as Gaza, we are not at liberty to infer that the stretch of coast from Gaza to Ekron was not taken from the Canaanites by the Philistines until a later time. The Canaanitish territory really extended as far south as Gaza, but did not quite reach to the sea. The author says this almost expressly; for before Gaza he mentions Gerar as the eastern limit of the Canaanitish territory. And this very Gerar is spoken of in Genesis as the most important place, and the seat of a Philistine king, in whose dominions the patriarchs sometimes took up their abode, using for pasturage the land which

was not set apart for agriculture, to which the Philistines as well as the Canaanites were addicted. Afterwards, however, the city seems to have lost its importance. In late history, already in Josh. xiii. 3, we find other cities named as the Philistine centres, viz. Gaza, Ashdod, Ekron, Askalon, and Gath, the seats of the five kings of the Philistines; while Genesis mentions but one king of the whole race. This change must be attributed to the increase of trade, by which means Gerar, so far distant from the sea, must have been pushed into the background. The Philistines were not, like the Canaanites, a nation who had already dwelt in the land from the time of their ancestors. This is indicated by their name, which, not without probability, has been derived from *פל*, to wander, which still exists in Ethiopic. But it has been wrongly asserted that this interpretation was already followed by the Alexandrians, who in many passages, like the apocryphal writers, render the name of the Philistines by *Ἀλλόφυλοι*. *Ἀλλόφυλοι*, properly a designation of the heathen generally, is equivalent to "non-Israelite," just as the Catholics speak of non-Catholics; and is in these passages only applied to the Philistines in particular. But all doubt is excluded by the fact, that in many passages of the Old Testament the Philistines are expressly termed a people who had immigrated. With respect to the place where they originally dwelt, there seems to be some variation between the Scripture accounts. In Gen. x. 14 they are called a colony of the Casluhim, who were descended from the Egyptians; while in other passages they are termed a colony of the Caphtorim, who were also of Egyptian descent, and are mentioned in the genealogical table in close connection with the Casluhim. But this apparent contradiction may be removed by assuming that the Philistines were a common colony of the two races which were closely related, and, like several of the Canaanitish races, were probably not very distinctly separated, so that they had grown almost to one people. But the chief point now is, to determine the dwelling-place of the Casluhim and Caphtorim. There can scarcely be a doubt that the Casluhim are the Colchians, the inhabitants of the south-eastern coast of the Black Sea. In favour of this view we have not only the almost complete identity of name, but also the fact that according to classical

writers the Colchians were a colony of the Egyptians. Herodotus says, ii. 104, "It is evident that the Colchians are Egyptians;" and in proof of this he draws attention to their black colour and their woolly hair, also to the fact that they practised circumcision, which certainly did not pass over to the Philistines; and that they manufactured linen cloth in the same way, and have a similar mode of life and language. Diodorus and Strabo speak in the same tone; and Ammianus Marcellinus calls the Colchians, *Ægyptiorum antiquam sobolem* (comp. these and other passages in Bochart, lib. iv. c. 31). If we come to this decision respecting the abode of the Casluhim, there can be little difficulty in choosing among the various opinions concerning the Caphtorim. The respective views of those who regard Caphtor as Crete, and those who regard it as Cyprus, appear untenable, even apart from the fact that they have no adequate foundation; because they separate the Caphtorim and Casluhim. Cyprus appears in the Old Testament under another name, Kittim. The only argument which has any apparent value, and which has lately been brought forward by Bertheau and Ewald in favour of Crete, is that the Philistines were called פְּרִתִּים in 1 Sam. xxx. 14, Ezek. xxv. 16, and Zeph. ii. 5; but this is set aside by the remark that פְּרִתִּים, from פָּרַת, exscindere, exules, extorres, was a second name of the Philistines, and had almost the same meaning as that which was current (comp. Strauss on *Zeph.* i. c.). In any case this argument is not strong enough to outweigh the counter arguments. On the other hand, the view which has been defended by Bochart with so much talent proves itself the only tenable one. According to it, Caphtor is Cappadocia, which borders immediately on Colchis. In opposition to this we cannot object, with some, that כַּפְתּוֹר is in Jer. xlvii. 4 called יָ; for this word signifies not merely island, but also coastland. But Cappadocia bordered on the Black Sea. A part of it was called the Pontian Cappadocia. Hitzig, in his *Urgeschichte der Philistäer*, Leipzig 1845, p. 15, objects that Cappadocia was not properly a coastland; but overlooks the fact that it is here specially considered as such. It was as a coastland that Cappadocia sent out the colony. The other objection made by Michaelis, chap. i. p. 301, viz. that Cappadocia was too far distant from Egypt, can prove nothing; for

according to the unanimous testimony of the ancients, Colchis, which was still farther distant, was an Egyptian colony. Again, it is said to be improbable that the Caphtorim should have founded a colony in so distant a land as Palestine. But this difficulty is obviated by the following remark. Some of the Casluhim and Caphtorim, after having been induced to emigrate to the borders of the Black Sea, perhaps by the ancient far-spread fame of that territory, which according to Strabo was the occasion of many expeditions, even in the mythical age of the Greeks, came to the resolution to retrace their steps, probably because their hopes were not altogether realized, or because they were seized with a desire to return to their native land. Accordingly they set out, and really penetrated to the boundaries of their own land; but there finding a pleasant abode, they gave up their original intention and remained. In favour of the view that Caphtor was the Pontian Cappadocia, we have also the unanimous and independent testimony of the ancients, particularly of the Alexandrian translation, of the Chaldee paraphrases, and of the Syriac version. At what time the immigration of the Philistines to their land took place cannot be accurately determined. Yet in no case do we seem to be able to go far beyond the time of Abraham. For according to Deut. ii. 23, another nation, the Avites, possessed the land before them, whom they expelled. These Avites, who, according to Josh. xiii. 3, appear to have existed as a remnant, and afterwards in a state of bondage to the Philistines, were probably of Canaanitish origin. To this assumption we are led by the analogy of the original inhabitants in the^e trans-Jordanic country and in Idumea, as well as by the want of any trace of other than Canaanitish original inhabitants in the whole region; also by the circumstance that the Israelites, who were everywhere directed only to the territory of the Canaanites, laid claim also to the Philistine region, comp. Josh. xiii. 2, 3; although not with the same determination with which they appropriated the remaining Canaanitish territory. Ewald's assumption, that the immigration of the Philistines first took place in the time of the Judges, is singular. Hitzig, p. 146, observes against it, that the book of Genesis would not have recognised already in Abraham's time a Philistine kingdom in Gerar, if there had not been a tradition that

long before Israel became a nation the Philistines were settled on this coast. Unsuspicious in itself, this tradition has been brought to us uncontradicted by its natural opponents, for it could not possibly be agreeable to the Israelites, because it established an older nobility and an older title of the Philistines. That the Philistines were already dwelling in the land when Israel immigrated, is asserted or presupposed in many passages of the Old Testament, while the contrary is never stated. We could only be induced to give up the unanimous testimony of later and earlier sources by arguments of greater weight, and these do not exist. The only argument on which Ewald bases his hypothesis, viz. the strong muster of the Philistines in the second half of the period of the Judges, cannot even serve to legitimize the hypothesis of Hitzig, that at that time the Philistines had received a new influx from Caphtor. It is satisfactorily explained by the inner breaking up and dispersion of Israel. The language of the Philistines, like that of the Egyptians, had a strong Semitic element: this is shown in words, such as Abimelech, Dagon, Beelzebub, Phicol—the Mouth of All, as the name of the highest servant of the king, who laid before him the wishes of his subjects. On the other hand, there are words for which it would be difficult to find a Semitic etymology,—for example, the names of the cities Ashdod and Askalon, the אֶשְׁדּוֹד as the name of the Philistine princes. To what stem this non-Semitic element belongs has not yet been satisfactorily determined; Hitzig's hypotheses run wild here. The preponderance of the Semitic element, which he vainly disputes, is the more easily explained, since the original inhabitants of the land and its environs spoke the Semitic language. Moreover we learn from the accounts in Gen. xx. 26, that the Philistines had already at the time of the patriarchs attained to no inconsiderable degree of culture and civilisation.

On the southern border of the Philistines and Canaanites, towards Arabia, began the territory of the Amalekites. These also, according to the prevalent view, had already occupied their dwellings at the time when Abraham began his wandering towards Palestine. But this view is incorrect; and strictly speaking the Amalekites do not belong here. They were descendants of Esau; and therefore in reality only a

single division of the Idumeans, who had nevertheless attained to a certain national independence, as appears from the fact that in the time of Moses they made war with the Israelites on their own account. That the Amalekites were an offshoot of the Edomites is evident from Gen. xxxvi. 12-16, where Amalek appears as the grandson of Esau. That he is the ancestor of the Amalekites is evident not only from the similarity of name, but also from the similarity of the dwelling-place; and especially from the improbability that a nation which already in the Mosaic time came into such important relations with the Israelites should be ἀγενεαλογήτος. The arguments which have been brought forward in opposition to this view disappear on nearer consideration. (1.) In Num. xxiv. 20 the Amalekites are termed "the oldest of the nations." But Amalek is here only called the beginning of the nations, the chiefest among them, the mightiest of the nations who were at that time hostile to Israel. This interpretation is favoured first by the passage, Amos vi. 1, where Israel is designated with respect to age nothing less than the chief of the nations, רִאשִׁית הַגּוֹיִם; a passage the more important the more clearly it refers back to the place in the book of Numbers, so that it must be regarded as the oldest commentary upon it. Again, the fact that the passage in Num. xxiv. 7, where a preference of Israel to the heathen is supposed to be indicated, says that their king will at some future time be more exalted than Agag, the *nom. dign.* of the Amalekite kings, can only be explained on the assumption that among all the neighbouring heathen nations Amalek was the mightiest, so that superiority over Amalek meant superiority over all the heathen. And that very quality of Amalek which is there predicted is distinctly set forth by the רִאשִׁית הַגּוֹיִם as soon as we explain the passage to mean "the chiefest of the nations." —(2.) "The Amalekites already appear in Gen. xiv. 7." Yet it is not said there the Amalekites were smitten; but, the plains of the Amalekites, that is, the plains where the Amalekites afterwards dwelt. And because elsewhere the people themselves are always named, the passage rather proves that the Amalekites were not yet in existence.—(3.) The different position of the Israelites with respect to the Idumeans and the Amalekites. But this may be explained by the

different position which these nations had assumed towards the Israelites. The hatred of Edom towards Israel ripened more rapidly among them than among his other descendants; and hence the Israelitish reaction against them took place sooner. The belief that the Amalekites are of like origin with the Canaanites owes its prevalence in a great measure to the authority of Michaelis. The advocates of this theory proceed on the assumption that the Canaanites came originally from Arabia, and maintain that that portion of the race which repaired to Palestine bore the name of Canaanites, while those who remained in Arabia were called Amalekites. (Comp. also Gesenius in the *Encyclop. of Ersch and Gruber*, part iii. p. 301.) But this view has already been shown to be highly improbable in the refutations of the hypothesis of the original Arabic dwellings of the Canaanites. It has not a single passage of the Old Testament in its favour; nowhere is a relation of the Amalekites to the Canaanites even hinted; and the relationship of the Amalekites to the Edomites, which has already been proved, is decisive against it. It rests solely on the testimony of comparatively late Arabic writers, whose little weight may be inferred from the circumstance that they represent the Philistines also as of the same race as the Canaanites. The Amalekites everywhere appear as a wild, warlike, plundering, nomadic tribe; and from the fact that their principal city was called the city of the Amalekites, 1 Sam. xv. 5, and had therefore no *nomen proprium*, it would appear that there were no other cities in their territory. They inhabited a barren, unfruitful region, a part of stony Arabia, which was not adapted to agriculture, and consequently was not favourable to the advancement of civilisation.

In the country which afterwards belonged to the Edomites, also on the southern boundary of the land of Canaan, but more to the east, towards the region which was afterwards covered by the Dead Sea, dwelt the Horites; comp. Gen. xiv. 6, xxxvi. 20-30, Deut. ii. 12; a nation of Canaanitic origin, a colony of the Hivites, as we infer from Gen. xxxvi. 2 compared with verse 20. They were still there at the time of Esau, and till they were partly destroyed by his race and partly driven away from their abodes. The Amalekites had their seat nearer the Mediterranean Sea. Bertheau's argument against

the Canaanitish origin of the Horites, taken from Gen. x. 19, where the plain of Jordan is mentioned as the extreme south-eastern point to which the Canaanites extended, is incorrect. That specification of the boundary has especial reference to the land pointed out to the Israelites. But the territory of the Horites, a colony which had removed from the chief land of the race, but had been destroyed long before this time, was not included in this. It had fallen to the Edomites, whose boundaries Israel was strictly forbidden to violate. From the copiousness with which the genealogy of the Horites is given in Gen. xxxvi. 5, Bohlen and Ewald have concluded that at the time of the composition of the Pentateuch the Horites still continued to dwell in the land of Seir, together with the Edomites, and in accordance with this view declare the genealogy in Deut. ii. 12 to be false. But the genealogy in Gen. xxxvi. is only added on account of two women of Horitic descent, Aholibamah and Timnah, who were among the ancestors of the Idumeans that were related to Israel. The account in Deut. ii. 12 is rather confirmed by Gen. xxxvi. For already Eliphaz, the son of Esau, had a woman from one of the most distinguished families of the Horites as a concubine; which presupposes that already at that time the power of the Horites was entirely broken; the Edomites appear as the sole possessors of the land, ver. 43. Again, the account of Deuteronomy is confirmed by the fact that in later times we do not find the smallest trace of the Horites. For it is self-evident that Ewald is wrong in believing he has found such a trace in Job xxx. 1-10. It has been concluded from the etymology of the race that the Horites must have been Troglodytes; comp. J. D. Michaelis' *Prælectio de Troglodytis Seiritis*, etc., in his *Syntagma Commentatt.* p. 195. This view is the more probable since Mount Seir contains numerous caverns adapted to this kind of life.

Our knowledge of the inhabitants of the region on the other side of Jordan is drawn principally from Gen. xiv. 5, which describes the march of the allied kings from Interior Asia through these territories, from north to south. Uppermost in Ashteroth Karnaim, in the district of Bashan, dwelt the Rephites, a people of great size and strength, who owe their name to this circumstance. The word, which properly signifies

"the feeble," was originally a designation of the departed, and was afterwards applied to the giants, because these, as the terror of all living, were supposed to be of gigantic stature. Lowermost, in that part which was afterwards the territory of the Moabites, and east from the southern half of the district which was afterwards covered by the Dead Sea, dwelt the Emims, so named on account of their formidableness. In Deut. ii. 10 they are termed a people great and many. Between these two tribes, therefore, in the district extending to the river Jabbok, afterwards Ammonitis, dwelt the Susim, called by the Amorites, according to Deut. ii. 19-21, the Zamzummims. That the Rephites, to whom in a wide sense the Emim and Susim also belonged, comp. Deut. ii. 11-20, were of Canaanitish origin, appears from the fact that the Israelites regarded the district of Og king of Bashan as belonging to them. At the time of the invasion of the Israelites they had almost disappeared. They were driven away from their possessions by the Ammonites and Moabites. Og king of Bashan, not individually, but together with his people, is in Deut. iii. 11 termed the last remnant of the Rephites. How very mistaken Bertheau is in concluding (p. 139) from this statement that he is called a king of the Amorites, and that he did not rule over the Rephites, appears from what has already been remarked. The Rephites were Canaanites, specially Amorites. But a considerable portion of the earlier Rephite possessions had shortly before the time of Moses been taken away again from the Ammonites and Moabites by the Cis-Jordanic Amorites, probably on the plea that the Rephites whom these tribes had expelled were their fellow-countrymen. And, as we have already remarked, Canaanitish races of giants are to be found on this side the Jordan also.

We now pass from Asia to Africa. Here the only country which attracts our attention is Egypt, where the beginnings of civilisation date from a very early period. It has been a favourite hypothesis of recent historiography, especially adorned by Heeren, that this culture had not its root in the country itself, but had come to it from Ethiopia, particularly from Meroe. But this hypothesis is already relinquished. The originality of Egyptian culture is more and more recognised. Wilkinson, part i. p. 37, speaks of the notion that the

colonization and civilisation of Egypt came down the Nile from Ethiopia as being quite set aside by recent investigations. The monuments of art in Ethiopia are not only inferior to those in Egypt, but also bear far less the impress of originality. Herodotus, ii. 30, also bears testimony to the priority of the Egyptians; and derives the civilisation of the Ethiopians from Egyptian refugees. At the same time, it remains true that the proper heart of Egypt was the south. Ezekiel names Pathros, or the most southern part of Egypt, as the birthland of Egypt, chap. xxix. 14; and Herodotus, in Book ii. chap. 15, speaks of very early migrations from Thebais to Lower Egypt, which latter, however, was the seat of empire in the time of the Penta-teuch. Another unfortunate hypothesis is that which makes Egypt to have been divided into several kingdoms in ancient times: a theory which has only been invented in order to dispose of the long succession of kings of Manetho, which might now easily be got rid of in some other way. The sacred narrative, monuments, classical writers, Manetho himself, all recognise but one Egyptian kingdom. Compare the copious refutation of this forced hypothesis, which was first brought forward by Eusebius, in Rosellini, i. p. 98 *et seq.* The name Mizraim itself is an argument in favour of the original unity. It has reference to the division of the land into Upper and Lower Egypt. Yet the dual does not denote the two separately, but only in combination. At the time of the patriarchs, the colonization and cultivation of Egypt were already complete; the priesthood, at least towards the end of this period, was already organized. How great their political power was even at that time appears from the fact that Joseph, when he was raised to the highest office in the state, was obliged to marry a daughter of the high priest at On or Heliopolis; and that the possessions of the priests remained, while the other inhabitants, when the famine arose, were obliged to give up their territories to the king, and to receive them from him as a loan; comp. Gen. xlvii. 22. It is evident from existing monuments, that among all the countries of the world Egypt attained the highest degree of culture at a very early period. "Practical life," says Leo, "has on all sides built upon Egyptian inheritance." In this respect Israel could and must learn from Egypt. But with respect to the higher conditions of exist-

ence, Egypt, like all the Hamitic nations, stood very low. We have already observed that recent Egyptian discoveries have been much less useful for the chronology and history of ancient Egypt than for its archæology. We can, therefore, only regard it as an error when Bunsen (whom Lepsius afterwards followed) charges the biblical chronology with error, on the basis of his Egyptian chronology which rests upon a tissue of hypotheses. Löbell, in the 1st volume of the *Weltgeschichte*, Leipzig 1846, has expressed himself in opposition to this view. Whoever makes himself acquainted with the condition of the biblical chronology by independent investigation, will not be in the least imposed on by the confidence with which Bunsen asserts his hypotheses against it; making a measure of that which is to be measured. With the same confidence we find him declaring a bad mutilation of the Johannine Epistles to be the original. Döllinger, in his *Streitschrift* against Bunsen's *Hippolytus*, has unsparingly disclosed the groundlessness of this assumption.

2. *In a religious aspect.*

Noah and his sons could not yet have lost the knowledge of the true God, although the crime of Ham shows how soon its moral influence began to decline. But the corruption of human nature was so great that the remembrance of the judgment of the flood could not long repress the outbreak of the fruit of this corruption, viz. idolatry. If once an inner connection with God, community of life with Him, be destroyed through sin, nothing outward, no traditionary knowledge, can preserve the knowledge of God in its purity. Only the spiritual man can know and worship God in spirit and in truth; the sensual and sinful man draws God down into his own confined sphere, partly from want of power to rise to Him, partly on account of his propensity to sin. He cannot bear the contrast which exists between his belief and his life. He must, therefore, suppress the outward knowledge of the true God, and stifle the inward voice which bears testimony to Him. He must create to himself higher beings who are subject to the same sins and weaknesses with himself, that he may excuse his own badness and silence his conscience by their example. We see this in rationalism, which attributes

its own moral laxity to God. Thus when the descendants of Noah had spread themselves farther over the earth, the revelations of God to the fathers were soon forgotten or disfigured. The rapidity with which such decay takes place may be seen by a glance at the present religious condition. Half a century has sufficed for rationalism to make almost completely a *tabula rasa*. Men were not able to give up God entirely. Although alienated from God, they yet felt the necessity of belief in a being exalted above their own weakness. For their whole existence seemed to them to be conditioned by a higher, and dependent on it. This was a real necessity, proving the possibility of a return of the human race to God. But fallen men could not find real satisfaction for a real want. Because they were unable to rise above nature to their Creator, they sought God in nature; because they stood in awe of the holy God, the punisher of the wicked and the rewarder of the good, they preferred making to themselves a physical god. They gave divine honour to that in nature which struck them by its beauty and use, or by its powerful and mysterious efficacy.

We may distinguish certain stages in idolatry, without, however, being able to maintain that all nations have passed through them in regular succession. The fundamental principle of idolatry is the confounding of nature and God, the intermingling of world-consciousness and God-consciousness, which must necessarily arise when sin becomes so powerful as to destroy the knowledge of the holiness of God and of His absolute personality over the world, with its high, strict, and inexorable moral demands, its claim to absolute sovereignty of will. Pantheism is not perhaps the production of the scientific reflection of later times; although it may have given it its form. With respect to its essence it is as old as sin. Compare the *Introduction to Symbolism and Mythology* of F. Jreuzer, who was the first of all mythologists to recognise the footsteps of idolatry on the pantheism of phantasy, but has made a great mistake in regarding this pantheism as a product of the healthy condition of man. "To regard nothing, absolutely nothing, in the whole visible corporeal world as quite dead, but to invest even the stone with a kind of life, is the peculiarity of this method of thought." "That which later

pantheistic abstraction comprises in the sentence, 'Nothing can be thought of which is not an image of the deity,' is fundamentally the old belief among such nations." At the first step all nature is regarded as an image and mirror of the one God, the whole life of nature as His life, each of its powers as His power. The *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* is here, that God is sought only in nature; and the saying, "Exalt thyself above nature," is forgotten. For this reason God is not really found in nature.

But idolatry cannot long remain at this step. As soon as the divine was once sought in nature, nothing lay nearer in the time of the supremacy of phantasy than the transition from pure pantheism to polytheism. Just as phantasy animates everything in nature, so it personifies everything. "What abstract knowledge calls working power," says Creuzer, "is the person of the original, naïve mode of thought." But with this the element of sex is at once assumed, and all those manifestations which are dependent on it—love and hatred, union and separation; of which the one places generation and birth as the immediate consequence, the other death and destruction. In this tendency of pantheism to polytheism, which has its deepest root in the extinction of a personal God in the soul, the divine forms are bad subordinates. The great heavenly bodies next arrest the attention of man. Sabaism, the worship of the sun, moon, and stars, is proved to be the most ancient form of idolatry in the East. The beauty and majesty of the heavens, which are there always starry, the regular movement of the heavenly bodies, and their perceptible influence upon earthly things, made it easy for men who were already estranged from the true God to regard them as the seat of very mighty deities, and to make them a special object of worship. In the book of Job, xxxi. 26–28, the origin of Sabaism is thus picturesquely described: "If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness; and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand: this also were an iniquity to be punished by the judge, for I should have denied the God that is above;" comp. Deut. iv. 19. Diodorus Siculus says of the Egyptians, i. 1, p. 10: "The ancient Egyptians looked with astonishment and wonder at the arrangement of the world and at nature, and arrived at the thought that there existed but two eternal and original

deities, the sun and the moon—the former they called Osiris, the latter Isis.” How insinuating this kind of worship must have been, appears from the fact that even the Neo-Platonists, who gave up many other national ideas as untenable, firmly maintained that the stars were or possessed imperishable and immortal souls, and were therefore entitled to worship. Even Aristotle was not free from this superstition. Astrology was soon added to the worship of the stars. From the relative position of the stars, and from their movements, men professed to read the future fates of whole nations and of individual men.

But the heavenly bodies were not the only objects of idolatrous worship. Adoration was paid to every terrible and every beneficent power of nature, wherever specially manifested.

Yet there were nations who happily remained at this second step of idolatry. This was the case especially with the Persians, who in the worship of the stars and the elements totally abstained from that of images; comp. Herodotus, i. 131. These nations were therefore most susceptible to the influence of revelation; in them the divine was not quite so degraded as in those who stood on the third step. In very early times the all-prevailing sensuousness and phantasy, corrupted by sin, led to the grossest materialism. “A universal impulse of human nature,” says Creuzer, “at a very early period demanded definite outward signs and symbols for indefinite feelings and dim presentiments. When we see even those nations who were star-worshippers fall into idolatry, we cannot wonder that this should be the case where sensuous pantheism prevailed; and when a universal reign of physical nature seized a powerful people with blind force, it was then urgently demanded that the form and power of this god should be made visible.” At first the symbol passed more or less for what it was, a sign, a mere representation. Worship was not given to the symbol, but to the thing symbolized. Soon, however, symbol and symbolized were confounded. It is very significant that among the Greeks the statuaries were called god-makers, *θεοποιοί*. Phantasy, which animates all things, first led to the idea that by a special effort of power the represented deity was present in the symbol; whether it were the work of men’s hands or of nature, as the sacred animals in Egypt. But soon the

nation fell into a delusion, which was fostered by the avarice and ambition of the priests, viz. that the deity was completely identical with the representative image. These two stages of idolatry are already distinguished from one another in a classical passage in the book of Wisdom, chap. xiii. In verse 2 those are reproved who deem "either fire, or wind, or the swift air, or the circle of the stars, or the violent water, or the lights of heaven, to be the gods which govern the world." But in verse 10 the error of those "who called them gods, which are the works of men's hands, gold and silver, to show art in, and resemblances of beasts, or a stone good for nothing, the work of an ancient hand," is characterized as the excess of foolishness.

Finally, the last step was taken when the development of mythology was added to the abuse of the symbol. The sources of mythology have been well unfolded by Creuzer. If once the partition-wall between God and nature and man be removed, not only is the divine humanized, but the human is also deified. The acts of those who rendered service to a nation were immensely exaggerated by tradition; they themselves were glorified by feasts, sculptures, processions, mimic representations, songs, and invocations. Soon the apotheosis is complete: either the number of gods is increased by a new one; or the tradition of a human benefactor of the nation is intermingled with that of an already existing god, and both are identified. Ancient biblical modes of expression are misconstrued, or understood in their rough and literal sense. That which was originally only symbolically-clothed doctrine is now treated as history; and inventive phantasy is occupied in adorning it more and more; still bringing more connection into it. Homer has many examples of this. In his traditions of the gods there is not unfrequently an ideal background, which, however, is no longer recognised by himself; comp. Nägelsbach, *Homerische Theologie, Einleitung*. A mass of fable is called forth by the historical interpretation of symbolical statuary. Remarkable phenomena and products of nature give occasion to the continuation of the history of the gods from whose agency they are derived. Among nations like the Greeks the distinction between truth and fiction is quite lost, and mythology is transferred from the region of truth to that of beauty;

the tradition of the gods is altered and developed according to their laws. By the contact of various peoples the gods and the myths pass from one to another, each by additions and alterations adapting the traditions to its own national character.

If we examine, by the help of the narrative in Genesis, how far idolatry had already advanced at the time of Abraham's call, we arrive at the result, that at that time there was scarcely a single nation among whom religious truth had been preserved in perfect purity; but that in most of them the last traces of it had not yet disappeared. The religious state at the time of Abraham's call appears to have been just what we should have expected—a transition-state, idolatry on the increase, true religion on the wane. Let us prove this with respect to the most important races and nations. That even Abraham's race was not free from idolatry appears from Josh. xxiv. 2, "Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, even Terah, the father of Abraham, and the father of Nahor; and they served other gods;" and ver. 14, "Put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the flood." The nature of this idolatry we learn from Gen. xxxi. 19, 30, 35, according to which Laban worshipped a kind of house-gods or Penates called Teraphim. Yet the worship of the true God had not quite disappeared from the family of Abraham. It appears that the Teraphim were worshipped only as inferior gods, through whom it was believed that the favour of the highest god might be secured, and by whose means he would impart counsel and knowledge respecting the future. Fallen man, conscious of his estrangement from God, seeks to fill up the gap with intermediate beings. Yet in the family of Abraham the traditions of the creation, the fall, the flood, etc., were preserved pure, and unsullied by any mixture of idolatry, being afterwards recorded by Moses in Genesis. Abraham already knew the highest God when he first revealed Himself to him! Laban acknowledges the most high God, the common object of Jacob's worship and his own, Gen. xxxi. 53, while he calls the Teraphim his gods, the particular which he has together with the universal. This supreme God he calls "the God of Abraham, and the God of Nahor, the God of their father." Jacob holds religious communion with him, which would not be conceivable if Laban were an actual idolater. The corrup-

tion of morals into which the Canaanites had fallen even in the time of Abraham, comp. Gen. xv. 16, leads us to suppose, judging from the close connection of sin and idolatry, that the latter had already made considerable advance among them. And yet it appears from the history of the priest-king, Melchizedek of Salem, that the true God had His servants even among the Canaanites. We certainly infer from the manner in which he characterizes the true God, as "the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth," Gen. xiv. 19, that the worship of inferior subordinate deities and the deification of nature was already common in his day and among his people. For the more definite designation by which he represents himself as Abraham's co-religionist has undoubted relation to prevailing religious error and delusion, which is also implied in the zeal with which he seeks to find in Abraham an associate in faith.

Rarum carum. The Canaanitish Hittites in Hebron, according to Gen. xxiii. 6, still retain so much religious susceptibility that they recognise in Abraham a prince of God, which would be impossible if they had quite lost the knowledge of a supreme God, and of a life devoted to Him. Among the Philistines also at the time of Abraham are to be found traces of the remains of a pure knowledge of God. Abraham confesses, Gen. xx. 11, his error in supposing that they were totally without the fear of God, acknowledges the territory of the *יראת אלהים* as common to him and the king of the Philistines, and considers only the *יראת יהוה* as peculiar to himself. The king is still open to divine punishment and warning in a dream, and is ready to do what God commands him; he pays high honour to Abraham as a servant of God. Comp. with ref. to Isaac, Gen. xxvi. We cannot, however, conclude from this, that at that time there was no idolatry among the Philistines. Circumstances were such that what remained of the pure knowledge of God must inevitably appear on such an occasion. The conception of the Godhead was never quite lost to polytheistic heathendom. Even in later Egypt the knowledge of a certain unity of God, who is certainly not the true God, forms the background of a rude polytheism. The sun, with its life-imparting power, is the primitive cause, from which the various divinities proceed, and which continually shines out behind them; comp. Leo, p. 120. The uncertain character of the

matter appears from the fact that Abraham was able to form such a misconception. Jablonsky, in the *Pantheon Ægypt. Proll.* c. 2, tries to show the transition from true religion to idolatry among the Egyptians. When Abraham, soon after his immigration into Canaan, went to Egypt; the king, according to Gen. xii., showed so much fear of God that he gave Sarah back to Abraham unharmed, as soon as he learned that she was his wife. But Jablonsky infers too much from this history when he asserts that at the time of Abraham idolatry had no existence in Egypt. It is scarcely credible that in so comparatively short a period as that from Abraham to Joseph, idolatry could have become so fully developed as we find it in the time of the latter. Already at that time the city On had been founded in honour of the sun, whose name, translated by the Alexandrians ἡλίου πόλις, means "sun" in Egyptian. In this city there was a high priest of the sun, whose daughter Joseph married, and whose name, Potiphera, Jablonsky, in essential agreement with later research, comp. Rosellini, i. p. 117, derives from the Egyptian, and interprets by "summus sacerdos solis"—more accurately "qui solis est;" making the name of his daughter Asnath to mean "Servant of the Goddess Nitha," who was worshipped at Sais in Lower Egypt. (The name is similarly explained by Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*.) From this we may form a probable conjecture concerning the nature of the priests mentioned in Gen. xlvii. 22, who had great power and great possessions. We are even justified in inferring from Gen. xliii. 32, that at that time the most abominable degeneracy of Egyptian idolatry, the worship of animals, was already current. It is there said, "the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination unto the Egyptians." This aversion of the Egyptians to associate with the Hebrews can only be explained on the ground that they were afraid of polluting themselves by contact with those who slaughtered animals to which the Egyptians paid divine honour. What Herodotus tells, ii. 41, of the Egyptians of later times exactly agrees with this: "The cow is worshipped by the Egyptians, and therefore no Egyptian, either male or female, may kiss a Greek as a stranger, or make use of his knife, or his spit, or his pot," etc. This is still the case among the Brahmins in India. At all events, the strict separation between the

Egyptians and all foreigners which existed at the time of Joseph, as we learn from Gen. xlv. 34, and which can only rest upon pseudo-religious grounds, shows that at that time the development of the Egyptian national religion had already made considerable advance. With respect to the Mosaic time this development is attested by Ex. viii. 26, where Moses answers the summons of Pharaoh to sacrifice to Jehovah in the land, with the words, "We shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord our God: lo, shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes, and will they not stone us?" Words which show that the inquiry relative to the purity of the animals offered in sacrifice was in full force,—an inquiry which rested upon a pseudo-religious foundation, and which according to Herodotus was carried on among the Egyptians with the most anxious care. The making of the golden calf in the wilderness suffices to show how deeply the worship of animals had at that time taken root among the Egyptians. So too, Lev. xvii. 7, where the Israelites were forbidden in the wilderness to sacrifice to devils after the manner of the Egyptians, *i.e.* to idols, who were worshipped under the form of rams and other animals. The way in which this worship of animals originated has already been stated. They were originally like statues, symbols of the divine, and as such they may in some measure have been regarded by the priests in later times; but the people paid divine honour to the animals themselves. The very first appearance of animal-worship bears witness to a deep religious degeneracy. A nation which finds the divine specially manifested in the animal-world must have completely lost the consciousness of that divine holiness which is not at all symbolized in the animal-world. At the time of Abraham's call, therefore, the last remnant of the true knowledge of God had not yet disappeared. But the mixture of idolatry and true religion which existed even at that time forms only the transition to complete forgetfulness of God, and departure from Him; and this would certainly have followed if God had not just at this time begun the execution of the plan He had designed from eternity.

§ 2.

HISTORY OF ABRAHAM.

We must enter less fully into the history of this period, in order not to encroach on the lectures on Genesis and the later portions of history, for which nothing is done in exegetical lectures. Our method must be conformed to this object. We shall not narrate, but only give remarks on what is related in the source, the knowledge of which we take for granted. We do this the rather, because that which is related in Genesis cannot be properly described except in the form in which it there occurs, and loses by any other form. Why change wine into water?

1. *Abraham's call*.—Abraham's father, Terah, was a rich shepherd-prince who, though he traversed the land with his flocks, had a fixed dwelling in Ur Chasdim. This Ur is probably that which is mentioned by Amm. Marcell. lib. 25, 8, a place in the north of Mesopotamia between the Tigris and Nisibis. Others, recently Bertheau (p. 206) and Ewald, have maintained that Ur is not a place, but a district. Thus the LXX., *χώρα τῶν Χαλδαίων*. But the goal of Terah's journey, Haran, is demonstrably a single place; and therefore we must regard his starting-point also as such. The cause of Terah's resolve to go to Canaan is not given in Scripture. Fables like that related by Joseph. *Antt.* i. 7, in which Abraham out of zeal for the honour of Jehovah takes counsel with the Chaldæans and Mesopotamians, deserve no notice. The reason was probably the same which still impels races of nomadic Arabs to distant wanderings; the hope to find in Palestine rich pasture for his numerous flocks. On this supposition it becomes evident why when he was come to Haran, to Carra, famous for the defeat of Crassus, in Mesopotamia, not far from Edessa and the Euphrates, west of Ur, he took up his abode there. In that pasture-ground he found what he had sought, and had no reason to continue his march farther. But the consideration of God's object in the matter is more important than that of Terah's motive. His secret guidance is not excluded by the existence of human motives. The kingdom of God was not to be founded among a nation already in existence. God wished to prepare a people for it; to possess a sacred primi-

tive ground of nationality. God dealt gently with Abraham, who was chosen as the progenitor of this race. He took from him only in the same proportion in which he had given to him. His demands increased gradually. Man can give up the earthly for the sake of God only in so far as God has made Himself dear to him and valued. God wished to be alone with Abraham. Only thus could He perfect his education. Abraham must go forth with his future kindred from sinful communion with his race; he may no longer dwell among a people of unclean lips. He must also cease to have communion with his immediate family. Even in it the apostasy from God was already so great that Abraham's remaining in it put great hindrances in the way of his divine education. He must be conducted to a people who were utterly strange to him, with whom he might hold no close intercourse, in whom God showed him the future hereditary enemy of his descendants. God could not at once demand this sacrifice from him, for it is certain that He does not tempt above what is able to be borne. The departure from his people and his country was facilitated by the circumstance that under God's direction his father and his other nearest relations accompanied him. Thus the first pain is overcome. His exodus from country is followed by his departure from the paternal roof; and to soften the pain of this, God gives him Lot for a companion, that he might not feel so utterly lonely. Later, when God speaks to him in secret, He frees him from this tie also, but arranges it so that his relative shall act an unfriendly part towards him, and thus facilitates this parting also.

In the promises which God makes to Abraham, partly in Mesopotamia and partly on his entrance into Canaan, there are three points to be noticed: (1.) He will make of him a great nation; (2.) He will give the land of Canaan to his posterity; (3.) in him, that is, as is afterwards explained, in his posterity, shall all nations of the earth be blessed. In Gen. xii. 3, where this promise first appears, and also in chaps. xviii. 18, xxviii. 14, we find the Niphal, which can have no other meaning than this, *Be blessed*; elsewhere we have the Hithpahel, which in a circuitous way leads to the same sense. For if the heathens bless themselves by the race of the patriarchs, *i.e.* wish to be thus blessed, comp. Gen. xlvi. 20, they must regard the lot of the

patriarchs, which consists in their relation to the Lord, as a highly prosperous one, and with this is inseparably bound up the striving to participate in their blessing, comp. Isa. xlv. 5. But we must separate two classes of passages; for it is a like perversion to impose upon the Niphal the meaning of the Hithpahel, and to impose upon the Hithpahel the signification of the Niphal. That the passages in which it occurs must be supplemented though not explained by antecedent and parallel passages in which the Niphal appears, is evident from the constant, solemn repetition of the announcement which is everywhere spoken of as the highest summit of the promises given to the patriarchs, and from the reference of the blessing upon all nations of the earth to the curse which passed on the world after the fall; also from the connection with the prophecy that Japhet should dwell in the tents of Shem (Gen. ix. 27) on the one side, and with the ruler who should go forth from Judah, to whom the allegiance of the nations should be (Gen. xlix. 10), on the other side. The intermediate members which unite these predictions are disturbed if we impose upon the Niphal, in the promises to the patriarchs, the signification of the Hithpahel. In these promises, we have at the outset a sketch of all the subsequent leadings of God until their final accomplishment. The great nation which is to proceed from Abraham is not composed of all the carnal descendants of Abraham, including the Arabs and Idumeans; as the union of this point with the two others shows, and also the whole subsequent history. The question here is not of the universal, but only of the special providence of God, by which Abraham became the progenitor of the chosen race. The land of Canaan was not to belong to him in the same sense in which it had belonged to its former inhabitants, who possessed it under the guidance of the general providence of God. It was to be an absolute gift of the free grace of God, and must clearly appear in this light. The last design of the first two promises discloses the third, which must have become dearer and dearer to Abraham as his inner life advanced. The great value of the blessing to Abraham and his seed, consisted in the fact that it was at some future time to become a blessing for all nations of the earth. This condition of the promises to Abraham, the fact that the special reference they contain to him and his posterity

appears as the foundation of an institution embracing the whole human race, stands in most beautiful harmony with that which is related in Genesis of the time previous to his call. In the first human pair, God created all men in His image. From the creation to Abraham the whole human race is an object of His guidance and government. In Gen. ix. 7, the blessing is pronounced on all the posterity of Noah. To such a beginning there can be no other continuation. How would a God who for centuries had embraced the whole, suddenly limit Himself to a single race and people, unless their limitation be destined to serve as a means of future expansion? "Those who bless thee," it is said, "I will bless, and those who curse thee, I will curse." Here at the first establishment of the kingdom of God a law is pronounced which is realized in the whole course of history. According to the position which each one assumes towards the kingdom of God and its bearers, so is his fate determined. For this is the criterion of his hatred and his love towards God Himself. The first grand verification of the announcement must have been experienced by Egypt in the Mosaic time. The promises to Abraham were at the same time so many demands. This is seen in the commands which are bound up with them. "Get thee out of thy country," etc., is special only in form,—in idea it includes everything which God requires of man, the going out from one's self, the offering up even of the dearest to God, if prejudicial to the divine life. Only let us ask, "Why should Abraham be called to go forth?" and this idea at once presents itself. That the universal foundation of the special was already known under the Old Testament is shown by the passage in Ps. xlv. 11, which is based upon Gen. xii. 1. Renunciation, self-denial, this requisition meets us at the very threshold of the kingdom of God. Here we have the foundation of that great saying of our Lord, "Whoever will be my disciple, let him take up his cross and deny himself." How deeply conscious Abraham was of this interchange of promise and obligation is seen in the fact that immediately on his entrance into Canaan he erected an altar, called upon the Lord who had appeared to him, and consecrated himself to Him, in the midst of the idolatrous people.

Why was Abraham led just to Canaan? In studying his

history and that of the other patriarchs, we find that the sojourn in this land was both a strengthening and a discipline of faith;—a strengthening, for the promised possession in its loveliness lay continually before their eyes—the more indefinite the idea of a hoped-for good, the more difficult is it to hold fast the hope. The favour they received at the present time in this land served as a pledge of the future glorification of God in that very place. It was a discipline of their faith, for they must have been vividly conscious of the contrast between hope and possession. How strange! they who could not call a single foot-breadth of the land their own property—for they had only the use of the pasturage so long as the inhabitants did not require it—should at some future time possess the whole country. They, with their small numbers, should drive out all the nationalities, whose numbers and might were daily before their eyes. But it is necessary that the reference to their posterity should be made still more prominent. The author of Genesis himself draws our attention to this by carefully noting every event by which any place in the country becomes renowned. It is a great blessing for a nation to have a sacred past. Israel was surrounded on all sides by dumb, yet speaking witnesses of the faith of their fathers, especially of the love of God towards them. Abraham's guidance to Canaan was thus in every respect dependent on God's determination to give it to his posterity for a possession. But now arises the new question, Why should his descendants have received Canaan in particular? The reasons for this determination, as far as they are given in Scripture itself, are the beauty and fruitfulness of the land, whose bestowal was well adapted to serve as a manifestation of the grace of God, the more since its advantages were brought home to the consciousness by the contrast of the surrounding wilderness which was populated by races kindred to Israel,—in the Pentateuch it is continually termed “a land flowing with milk and honey,” and in Deut. xi. 10–12 is represented as in many respects superior given to Egypt,—and again the circumstance that the inhabitants of this land had filled up the measure of sin particularly fast and early, comp. Gen. xv. 15, 16, so that in the taking and giving of it, justice and mercy could go hand in hand. This union was at the same time of deep

significance for the mind of Israel. In the fate of the earlier inhabitants they had before them a constant prediction of their own fate if they should prove guilty of like sin. Already in the Pentateuch Israel is referred to this prophecy. These are the reasons which appear in Scripture. What many have said concerning "the central position of Palestine" is not supported by Scripture. In Ezek. v. 5, "This is Jerusalem: I have set it in the midst of the nations and countries that are round about her," Jerusalem is designated only as the moral-religious centre of the world, in order that its guilt and degeneracy might appear in a stronger light, as verse 6 clearly shows, and also verses 7 and 11.

Nicolaus Damascenus relates in a fragment of the 4th book of his History, which has been preserved by Josephus, i. 8, that Abraham remained for a long time at Damascus on his way to Canaan, and there conducted the government. Justin, lib. 36, says the same; and Josephus relates that the house is still shown in Damascus where Abraham lived. But we can scarcely understand how Hess, and even Zahn, as also Bertheau, who bases upon this his hypothesis of a wandering of the "Terahitish people," and subsequently Ewald, who calls Nicolaus Damascenus "a witness of great weight," could attribute any value to this account. Heidegger, ii. p. 60, has proved that it belongs to the numerous legends respecting Abraham which are current in the East. It has been inferred from the remark in Gen. xv. 2, that Abraham's house-steward belonged to Damascus, and hence the conclusion has been come to that Abraham must have sojourned in that place. But it can be proved on chronological grounds that Abraham continued his journey to Canaan without any pause by the way. And here we may remark, that the same judgment holds good with reference also to all other accounts of heathen authors; such, for example, as we find collected in Buddeus and Hess. Their origin is written on their foreheads. They belong to a period when, owing to the wide dispersion of the Jews, fragments of the narratives contained in their holy writings found their way into all heathendom. They are composed of a true element drawn from this source and increased by some very cheap but false additions. So, for example, when Artapanus in Eusebius speaks of the sojourn of Abraham with the king of

Egypt, and maintains that Abraham instructed this king in the art of astrology; an assumption which has its origin merely in the statement of Genesis that Abraham came out of Ur of the Chaldees; for the Chaldæans were highly renowned among the ancients for astrology; or where Alexander Polyhistor relates that Abraham's name was famous throughout all Syria, and that he proved to the most learned Egyptian priests the nullity of their doctrines.

We must guard against using accounts of this nature in confirmation of biblical history. Let us rather leave this dealing to the opponents of revelation. Such statements could only have a value if it could be proved that they had their origin in a source independent of Genesis. But, *à priori*, how is this conceivable? Whence could the knowledge of Abraham come to those who knew nothing but fables concerning their own ancestors, or to those who were totally unable to estimate the importance of that which was really significant in Abraham's appearance, and to whom he was a man of no interest. Add to this that the oldest historians, those who lived before the time of the dispersion of the Jews and circulated the narratives of Scripture, especially from Alexandria, know nothing of Abraham.

It is noticeable also with respect to chronology, that Abraham was 75 years old when he set out on his journey to Canaan, 366 years after the flood and 2023 after the creation of the world, and that Terah survived his departure for 60 years, although his death is related in Genesis prior to the exodus of Abraham, in order that the narrative may henceforth occupy itself exclusively with Abraham. Shem was still alive at the time of Terah.

2. *Abraham in Egypt.*—In this narrative our attention is directed almost exclusively to the inquiry into Abraham's morality; a secondary matter whose proper treatment is dependent upon that view of the true kernel and centre of the narrative which prompts the author to communicate it. The birth of the son who was destined by God to be the ancestor of the chosen race, was the beginning of the realization of all the promises that had been made to Abraham. The rest hung upon this birth, and many years elapsed before it took place. The human conditions must first disappear, and at the same

time it must be demonstrated by many providences, that God had a part in the matter. This event forms the beginning of these leadings of providence. Abraham himself by his carnal wisdom does what he can to nullify the promise. But God takes care that the chastity of the ancestress of the chosen race shall be preserved inviolate. And just as this circumstance is a manifestation of the providence of God, it formed also an actual prediction of the importance of His decree, and served to strengthen Abraham's faith. It is the author's aim to draw attention to this. The judgment of Abraham's conduct he leaves as usual to his readers, if they find any interest in it. The author writes not as a moralist but as a theologian. The judgment of readers, who were unable to follow the grand abstraction of the author, has been very various. Luther goes farthest, stating in his *Commentary on Genesis* that Abraham formed this resolution by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and in strong faith. Chrysostom too, and Augustine seek to exonerate Abraham from all guilt; Origen, Jerome, and the theologians of the Reformed Church form a severe judgment, and express strong disapprobation of the subterfuge.

It is certain that Abraham had no intention of committing a sin. It was not a sudden idea. Already in Haran he had pre-arranged it with Sarai. Doubtless he thought he could say with a good conscience that Sarai was his sister, because she really was his sister in a certain sense. She was his near relation, the daughter of his brother Haran. For Sarai is identical with Iscah mentioned in Gen. xi. 29. She was first called Sarai, *my dominion*, on her marriage with Abraham. Augustine says, "Tacuit aliquid veri, non dixit aliquid falsi." He was so strongly persuaded of the innocence of this precautionary measure, that according to Gen. xx. 13, he had determined to adopt it everywhere, and did actually repeat it afterwards; as Isaac did also.

But nevertheless Abraham cannot be pronounced guiltless. He is not to be blamed for having acted in accordance with his conviction, but because this conviction was a false one, and had its origin in his own inclination, not in the thing itself. His statement was nothing less than a hidden lie. For in saying that Sarai was his sister his intention was that those to

whom he said it should understand him to mean that she was not his wife; and they did actually understand it in this sense. Rambach therefore justly remarks, "The whole thing was the result of a weak faith which suffered itself to be beguiled by carnal wisdom into the use of improper means, viz. an equivocation for the preservation of his life and the chastity of his wife." It was once said, "*Non facienda sunt mala ut eveniant bona.*" He would have done better if he had commended the whole matter to God in earnest prayer, and had then repaired thither in reliance on the divine promise to make of him a great nation and to bless him. But because he directed the eyes of his reason too exclusively to danger, he lost sight of the promise of God, and his faith began to waver. But as Christ reached His hand to Peter when he began to sink at the sight of a great wave, so God extended His hand to Abraham lest he should utterly perish in this danger.

Many here enunciate views by which they are often misled afterwards. Thus Zahn remarks, "It is difficult, nay impossible, from our position to form a correct judgment concerning the life of the ancients. The 19th century before Christ is brought into close comparison with the 19th century after Christ. This will not do."

If the question were how to excuse Abraham, it would be impossible for us to judge harshly. He stood at the very threshold of the divine leadings, and came from the midst of a degenerate people with whom, though outwardly separate, there was close connection. We cannot expect to find him a saint. Many of his severe judges certainly pronounce judgment on themselves. In the joy of finding an imperfection in the father of the faithful they forget that their whole life is a continuous lie, since they have had far more opportunity of recognising the unconditional obligatory power of the law of truth; and a far stronger inward condition of grace has been offered to them for its fulfilment.

But here a justification may rather be attempted, which we must decidedly oppose. It is only possible by making the building power of the divine law dependent on the stage of development, which again demands that the law be regarded as a kind of arbitrary thing, and thus the will of God is separated from His essence, which is highly injurious. If the

will of God be only a reflex of His essence, it must be valid for all times ; and moral requirements are the same for the rudest period as for the most advanced. Thus there is but one conscience for all times ; and it is man's fault if he do not perceive all its demands.

That the narrator himself regarded the matter in this light may, amid all the objective tendency, be clearly proved from the circumstance that he lays the entire stress of the thing upon the agency of God. The very issue of the matter confirms this. Abraham is not rescued by his own carnal wisdom. This rather plunges him into the greatest embarrassment and anxiety, from which God's intervention alone delivers him. Pharaoh's conduct when he apprehends the true state of the matter is an additional argument in favour of this view. "Why," he says, "hast thou done this unto me?" If Pharaoh has the consciousness that wrong has happened him through Abraham, he must the more readily assume that Abraham, by his own free-will, stifled the consciousness of wrong-doing ; especially if we compare the still more definite reproaches of the king of the Philistines, chap. xx. 9 *et seq.* But Abraham must be exonerated from another reproach, viz. that of having exposed his wife to the lust of the Egyptians. He only hoped to gain time by his precautionary measure. Before the tedious Egyptian marriage ceremonies were at an end, he hoped to find some way of escape. His faith was not yet strong enough to induce him to surrender himself with absolute trust to God, who had compelled him by circumstances to go down to Egypt. For the moment, therefore, he sought to help himself by his own wisdom ; the future he left to God. Here his faith could co-exist with the visible ; for the visible did not yet lie before his eyes and fix his attention upon itself. The difficulty of Sarah's age is also without weight. We have only to remember that the usual duration of life at that time amounted to 130-180 years ; and we may add that among the Egyptians the women had a most disagreeable complexion. That it appeared so even to the Egyptians themselves, is evident from the circumstance that upon their monuments the women are painted much fairer than they were in reality, while the men bear their natural colour (comp. Taylor, p. 4), and that everywhere the Egyptian women were exceptionally ugly, as

the representations in Wilkinson and Taylor show. But the main point is, that the effort of Oriental princes to fill the harem has its origin less in sensuality than in vanity. The high position of Sarah was the great thing in the eyes of Pharaoh; a certain beauty and stateliness was only the condition. Moreover the mighty help of the Lord, which was exerted in Egypt on behalf of Abraham against Pharaoh, was a type and prelude of that to be vouchsafed to his posterity.

3. *Abraham's Separation from Lot.*—The essence of this narrative is the divine providence by which circumstances occurred to remove from him an element not belonging to the chosen race. Under this providence Lot voluntarily gave up all his claims to the land of promise. He repaired to the plains of Jordan, which were doomed to destruction. That the whole importance of the event in the eyes of the narrator himself turns on this point, appears from chap. xiii. 14, where the renewal of the promise of the land of Canaan to Abraham is introduced with the words, "And the Lord said unto Abraham, after that Lot was separated from him." From this it appears that the renewal is not only in its proper place here, but serves at the same time as a means of development and closer definition. When the land is promised to Abraham's posterity as an eternal possession, the idea naturally is, that no power from without shall ever deprive him of it. That by Israel's guilt the possession should be lost at a future time, is frequently foretold in the Pentateuch itself. An assurance to the contrary would have been a licence to sin; but the land was only withdrawn from the true posterity of Abraham that they might be made partakers of a higher inheritance. When the patriarch, in obedience to the divine command, traversed the whole land in its length and breadth, his action was symbolical, indicating that his posterity should become possessors of the territory in which he wandered as a stranger. He takes possession for his descendants, of the whole land in which he himself has not a foot-breadth of property; thus giving evidence of the faith which it was God's object to nourish and strengthen by this command. Lot, the type of a sojourner and lodger in the kingdom of God in contrast to its citizens, was probably not influenced in his choice of a residence by the consideration of the beauty of the region. He sought the

neighbourhood of towns, whose restless life and pursuits constantly offered new excitement to one for whom the simple shepherd-life was too monotonous. He belonged to those who could not exist without hearing *αἰεί τι καινότερον*. If this were not so, how are we to explain the fact that he afterwards settled down in the midst of the immoral city itself? It is true that he did not take part in their abominations—his earlier intercourse with Abraham had so much influence on him; yet he was too weak completely to withstand the corruption by which he was surrounded. And now he was called upon to suffer with those who had not been too bad for him to rejoice with. Formerly he stood as a free shepherd-prince, in no close connection with the inhabitants of the land; but now he was involved in their affairs, and was soon afterwards led forth as a captive with the other inhabitants of Sodom.

4. *Abraham's warlike expedition.*—*Melchizedek.*—We have already treated of the campaign of the kings of Central Asia against the kings in the plains of Jordan. In Abraham's conduct two principal features of his character are exemplified—courage and magnanimity, sanctified by childlike confidence in the goodness of God. But the eye of the narrator is not directed to this. The centre of the narrative is God's grace respecting His chosen people, by which, in prefiguration of that which was to be imparted to Abraham's race, He placed him in a position to carry on war with the kings, and gave him the victory over them, bringing kings to meet him after his return—one in respectful recognition, the other in bitter subjection. A casual remark shows us how rich and powerful Abraham had already become through the divine blessing. With him alone there travelled 318 servants born in his house, sons of his slaves, who had grown up under his eye, and of whose fidelity he could be certain. But these formed only the smaller part of his people. They were certainly far outnumbered by the newly-purchased servants, old men, children, and women; and even of those who could carry arms, some were not able to accompany him. A few must remain for the protection of the flocks. Thus it is easily explained how Abraham could mix everywhere with the Canaanitish kings as their equal. He was this by right; and had also power to enforce the recognition of the right. There was scarcely one among the

Canaanitish princes who could singly measure his strength with him.

The shortness and the obscurity of the narrative has occasioned the most various and strange opinions relative to Melchizedek. Origen held him to be an angel; others believed that he was Christ, who had appeared to Abraham in his later human form, and had presented the supper to him. So also Ambrose and many old theologians. The Chaldee paraphrasts with many Jewish and Christian scholars believed that Melchizedek was Shem, the son of Noah, who was still living then. Others took him for Enoch, who had been sent by God from heaven to earth again, in order to administer the kingly and priestly offices.

All these are but baseless hypotheses. Theodoret's view is the correct one; he says, "He was probably of those races who inhabited Palestine; for among them he was both king and priest." The fact that there should have been a servant of the true God in the midst of the heathen, which at first appears strange, has already been explained. Zahn says, "A lovely picture of peace stands before us after the tumult of war; a king of righteousness pronouncing blessing, a king of the city of peace, a priest of God. The mention of Melchizedek shows how much the holy Scripture conceals. How many other priests of God may not his lifted hands have raised up to God the Most High, from the midst of that human race which was ever turning more and more from God." But the expression "how many" says too much. The reason why the author speaks so fully and emphatically lies just in the solitariness of the phenomenon; it is on this account that the memory of the event was preserved in tradition. Melchizedek places himself in distinct contrast to his surroundings; and, according to the remark in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the author shows how little these are calculated to explain his existence by the fact that he is almost completely silent concerning them (*ἀπάτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος*, Heb. vii. 3); and even if we were perfectly acquainted with these relations we should know nothing more of the main question. He stands severed from natural development, as a wonder, in the midst of an apostate world. At a later time, indeed, such an isolated phenomenon would no longer have been possible. A form

like Melchizedek's does not meet us again in all subsequent history. For Jethro, the priest of Midian, is only a very imperfect counterpart. Melchizedek may be called the setting sun of primitive revelation. Deep shadows continue to gather over the heathen world, while the light concentrates itself more and more within the divine institutions of salvation.

Melchizedek dwelt at Salem, the Jerusalem of after times, which in antiquity-loving poetry still bears this name in Ps. lxxvi. 2: "In Salem also is His tabernacle, and His dwelling-place in Zion." No other Salem appears in the New Testament; for in Gen. xxxiii. 18 שלם is an adjective: "And Jacob came in a prosperous condition to the city of Shechem." Still further, Jerusalem, from ירוש and שלם, *the peaceful possession*, is essentially the same name. [The dual form is an invention of the Masoretes.] The identity of Salem and Jerusalem is also presupposed in Ps. cx., which was composed by David. For when it is there announced that the Messiah will be king and priest in Zion after the order of Melchizedek, it is undoubtedly assumed that primitive time prefigures in the same place a similar union of the kingly and priestly dignity. Another fact which speaks in favour of the identity of Salem and Jerusalem is that in Joshua's time, Adonizedek, equivalent to Melchizedek, is called king of Jerusalem, Josh. x. 1. In all probability this was the standing name of the Jebusite kings. Finally, the King's Valley at Salem, Gen. xiv. 17, lay, according to 2 Sam. xviii. 18, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem; according to Josephus, two stadia distant from it. Thenius says on this place, that the King's Valley was a part of the valley through which the Kedron pours itself into the Dead Sea. W. L. Krafft, the topographer of Jerusalem, remarks: "If Abraham with the spoil chose the most convenient and shortest way back to Hebron over the high land on this side of the Jordan, he must have passed not far from Jerusalem. While the king of Sodom ascended the present Wady en Nar, in which the valley of Kedron extends to the Dead Sea, Melchizedek descended from his rocky fortress, Salem, to salute Abraham." Melchizedek united in himself the kingly and priestly dignity; a combination which was not rare, indeed almost universal. Aristotle, *Politic.* iii. chap. 14, says, "In antiquity the subjects invested their ruler with the

highest power, giving to one and the same the judicial, kingly, and priestly dignity." Servius also remarks on Virgil, "*Sane majorum hæc erat consuetudo, ut rex etiam esset sacerdos vel pontifex.*" In Homer the prince not only arranges the *sacra* in the interest of the community, but not seldom dispenses it himself without the assistance of the priest; comp. Nägelsbach, *Homerische Theologie*, p. 180. Nor is it accidental that this union of the two powers appears in the highest antiquity. In later times the further development of the two spheres made it necessary to separate them. This was a concession to human weakness so far that, owing to it, two interests could scarcely be united in one person without danger to the one or other. Therefore, the separation occurred also among the people of revelation under the Mosaic dispensation. But in Christ, who was not subject to human weakness, the original union, which is also the most natural, was restored. Melchizedek is therefore justly represented in Scripture as a type of Christ. The idea symbolized in Melchizedek, viz. that of a prince, who at the same time represents his people before God, is realized in Him in its whole extent and in its profoundest depth.

Melchizedek brought out bread and wine to Abraham. Abraham was not in need of the food for his people. He had just conquered his enemies, and had taken rich spoils from them, even food (food is expressly mentioned in verse 11). But in ancient times presents were a token of esteem and love, as they are still in the East. Melchizedek paid honour to Abraham as a worshipper of one and the same God; he must already have heard of his piety, and rejoiced in finding an opportunity of proving his esteem for him. The bringing forth of bread and wine was therefore a symbolical act, in reality a proof of community of faith, and at the same time a worthy preparation for the impartation of the blessing which had its basis in this community. We have no authority to put more meaning into the offering of the bread and wine, as v. Hofmann does. According to the narrative, it is related to the Last Supper only in one respect, only so far as the latter was a love-feast. In saying "The narrative certainly does not imply that he brought bread and wine only to refresh Abram, or else it would not be added immediately, in the same verse, 'and he was a priest of the most high God,'" v. Hofmann overlooks

the fact that these words are a preparation for what comes after, "and he blessed him." Melchizedek king of Salem (with kingly hospitality) brought forth bread and wine, and at the same time he blessed him in his capacity of priest. Melchizedek blessed Abram as "a priest of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth." Thus Melchizedek himself specifies the God whom he served; for this designation has not previously occurred, and is nowhere else to be found. It cannot therefore belong to the writer. He chose the appellation to indicate that his God was not ruler over a single family or district, or over some star as the neighbours believed their idols to be, but was the omnipotent God of the whole world. Such absolute extension was the necessary condition of his community of faith with the monotheistic Abraham.

With the exception of this kingly priest not a trace is to be found in all pre-Mosaic history of a priesthood consecrated to the true God, if we except the uncertain history of Jethro, who probably first got from Moses the most of what we find in him; just as Balaam drew his knowledge of God from an Israelitish source. Although we cannot more nearly define the nature of the priesthood of Melchizedek, we may conclude that it was a public one from the circumstance that Abraham was not called a priest, although he built altars and offered up sacrifices for himself. It is probable that not only the inhabitants of Salem but also the dwellers in the regions round about, so far as they had not yet sunk into idolatry, brought their offerings to him that he might present them to the most high God, and make intercession for the people in prayer. All that was still in existence of the elements of true piety among the Canaanites gathered about him.

Abraham paid the highest honour to Melchizedek. To show that he recognised his dignity he gave him the tenth part of the spoil, and that too of the whole spoil, even of what had originally belonged to the inhabitants of the plain of Jordan. For in accordance with the rights of war at that time this belonged to whoever had taken it from the robbers; and only Abraham's generosity made him renounce all personal claim to it. He had no power to dispose of the part which belonged to God and that which belonged to his

associates. In his address to the king of Sodom he uses the same designation of God which Melchizedek had employed immediately before, thus to acknowledge in the face of the idolaters that their mutual faith rested upon the same foundation. But at the same time he intimates by the name of Jehovah which he puts to this designation, tenderly and softly, at the head of it, that he has more part in the common basis than Melchizedek; that his religious consciousness, though not purer than that of the royal priest, is yet richer and fuller. God appeared as Jehovah only to Abraham, by means of a divine revelation made specially to him. It is this in particular which secures the continuance among Abraham's descendants of what was common to him with Melchizedek. The most high God, etc., could only be permanently recognised where He revealed Himself as Jehovah.

This narrative shows clearly the groundlessness of the reproach of particularism so often made against the Old Testament. Whenever the heathen world offered anything worthy of recognition, it was lovingly and ungrudgingly recognised. The reason why this recognition afterwards fell more into the background is to be found in the fact that there was always less and less to be recognised; that the heathen-world became darker and darker. Thus the narrative alone suffices to refute those who, like Ewald (p. 370 *et seq.*), would willingly turn the monotheism of the patriarchs into a monolatry, and represent them as worshippers of a single domestic God whom they kept solely for themselves, and exalted above all those worshipped by others. They maintain this only in order to escape the disagreeable necessity of having to accept a supernatural source of the patriarchs' faith. That which these critics deny to Abraham was possessed even by Melchizedek; Abraham had in common with him the very thing upon whose foundation the higher and peculiar prerogative was raised up. There is not even the semblance of a proof that the God of the patriarchs was a mere house god, along with whom they allowed scope for other deities. It appears from history, and indeed is self-evident, that their neighbours could not at once raise themselves to this height; which proves all the more clearly how little the faith of the patriarchs can itself be explained by purely natural causes.

5. *God's covenant with Abraham.*—The essence of this narrative is God's condescending love to His chosen, by virtue of which He not only vouchsafed to them the blessing of the covenant, but also strengthened their weakness by a sign. We may remark, *à priori*, that the whole substance of Gen. xv., although it is to be regarded as having actually occurred, is yet, according to the express statement in verse 1, not an objective but a subjective thing. Abraham is already, in Gen. xx. 7, called prophet, נביא, as also all the patriarchs, in Ps. cv. 15. The essence of prophecy is divine inspiration. נביא means properly *the inspired*. But according to Num. xii. 6 the two forms in which God revealed Himself to the prophets were visions and dreams. In this narrative we have the two combined. After the rest had passed before him in a vision, Abraham falls finally into a prophetic sleep. V. Hofmann has indeed denied the inwardness of the occurrence (p. 98), with the exception of the dream-revelation in chap. xv. 12-16. But his assumption that the expression *in a vision* in verse 1 means nothing more than that this revelation is prophetic is without foundation: מראה and the designations corresponding to it always refer in the first instance to the form not the contents of divine revelations. The nature of that which is related also speaks in favour of its inwardness. According to verse 5, compared with verse 12, Abraham saw by day the stars in heaven; which was only possible in a vision. On the assumption of outwardness, the contents of verse 12 are inexplicable. It is evident from the beginning of the narrative that the renewal and ratification of the promise contained in it were occasioned by a temptation to which Abraham's faith threatened to succumb. This temptation did not perhaps consist in fear of Chedorlaomer's revenge, but in doubts which were called forth in him by his childlessness, as we see clearly from the narrative. He looked at natural causes, and feared that nothing might come of all the salvation that had been promised him. He felt himself lonely and forsaken. His faith wavers because it finds so little support in the visible; but it proves itself to be faith by endeavouring to derive strength from the word of God, and does actually find support. Abraham lays before God what appears in his eyes to nullify all the promises made to him; the fact that he has no son and heir, and in the

ordinary course of nature has no longer any hope of getting one. God promises him a son, and by him a numerous posterity: at once he grasps the word with joy. Doubt disappears, since he knows that the counsel of God stands for ever. The proper essence of faith is to trust in God's word and power, and by this means to rise above all visible things. "Abraham believed the Lord; and He counted it to him for righteousness." But Abraham is conscious of his human weakness. He begs God for a sign by which he may know that His promise to him will be fulfilled. The highest step of faith is indeed to believe simply in the word of the Lord without any sign. But Abraham felt, as Gideon did later, Judg. vi. 37, and Hezekiah, 2 Kings xx. 8, that he had not arrived at this stage; that he needed an embodiment of the promise to overcome the sensuous and visible which resisted it. God condescended to give him such a sign, and showed how firm His promise was by binding Himself to its fulfilment in the same way by which in those days a mutual promise between men was solemnly sealed; although properly speaking this was not appropriate, which may be said also of the oath to which God frequently condescends in Scripture, though it is really adapted for man only. Sacrificial animals were slain and divided, and the promising party passed between them for a sign that his promise was sacred, made under the divine sanction, and also as a proof of his readiness, in case the covenant should be broken, to take upon himself divine punishment, and to be cut in pieces like the slaughtered animals. This solemn sanction of the promise—and that is the point in question—was not intended merely for Abraham, but also for his posterity. How could they doubt, without sacrilege, that God, the foundation of the sacredness of every human promise, should Himself keep the vow so solemnly made? At the same time the offence which later divine providence might present to weak faith was avoided. Abraham's descendants must leave the land of promise, must live for a long time in hard servitude in Egypt; all human hope of the fulfilment of the promise of Canaan's possession must disappear. But while God here predicts this guidance, He shows that the very thing which appears to disturb the promise forms the beginning of its realization. Birds of prey descend on the sacrificial animals, upon which the number 3 is impressed—they must

all be three years old—as the signature of the divine, that which is consecrated to God; but Abraham, the representative of the Abrahamic covenant, scares them away. The meaning of this symbol is, that human power will try to nullify God's covenant, but will prove unsuccessful and then be instructed by the word. For four hundred years the descendants of Abraham will serve in a strange land; God will then judge their oppressors, and they shall go forth with great possessions. At the same time an indication is given of the cause of the long interval intervening between the promise and its fulfilment. The iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full, though already far advanced. This must first be fulfilled and the necessity arise for the manifestation of God's punitive justice, that by this means the expression of His love to His people may have free course. The fact that in this vision God appears to Abraham in the form of fire points to the energetic character of His essence. Wherever fire appears in relation to God, it characterizes Him as personal energy. This divine energy first becomes visible in His punitive justice, which from the connection must be regarded as having been first directed against the enemies of the chosen race, so that the appearance is symbolical, and means "those who curse thee, I will curse." But at the same time an appeal is made to the elect themselves, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." Yet God reveals Himself as sacred fire in love as well as in righteousness; in love which manifests itself to the individual believer and to the whole church.

6. *Abraham and Hagar*.—God's covenant-truth soon found an opportunity for manifestation. Abraham himself did what he could to nullify the promise. This is the principal point of view from which the narrative is to be looked at. It has often been maintained that Abraham did not commit sin in this matter. God did not tell him that he should beget the promised son by Sarai. But if his eyes had been quite pure, he would have known that it could not be otherwise. Sarai was his lawful wife. The narrative itself points to this, for Sarai is expressly and repeatedly called the wife of Abraham, and in this designation we find the writer's judgment on Abraham's action. Polygamy was at variance with the divine institution of marriage; and though it might last for a period owing

to the divine forbearance, yet it was never allowed as lawful. How then could Abraham think that the birth of the son of promise should be brought about by a violation of the divine order? But he did not make this reflection, because it appeared quite too improbable to him and still more so to Sarai, that the promise should find its longed-for fulfilment in the ordinary way. He thought it necessary therefore to help God, instead of waiting quietly till He should bring the matter to its conclusion; but the violation of divine order soon avenged itself, as the author relates with visible purpose. The unnatural relation in which the slave was placed to her mistress, by the consent of the latter, prepared sore trouble for her.

The care manifested by the angel of the Lord for a runaway slave only appears in its right light if we regard it as an emanation of God's love to Abram. The main object of the narrative is to make this apparent, and so to attract his posterity into love towards such a God. Any other object is doubtful. Many say, we must look upon Hagar as the ancestress of one of the most numerous peoples of the whole earth. If Ishmael had been born and educated in idolatrous Egypt, then the nation springing from him would have been poisoned in its very origin. Growing up in the house of Abram, he must at least have imbibed some good qualities. And so it actually was. The pre-Mohammedan religion of the Arabs is the purest of all heathen religions. Even the Mohammedism founded on it contains a multitude of fragments and germs of truth which give it the preference over all heathen religions. On the other hand, it may be objected that the assumption of a continuance of the original tradition among the posterity of Ishmael is untenable, that Mohammedism is only superior to heathenism in one respect, in every other it is decidedly worse. But it is enough to note that Scripture does not give the slightest indication of such a point of view. It is necessary to be on our guard against the confidence with which so many in the present day impose their own ideas on Scripture. What Scripture wishes to tell us it does tell clearly and definitely.

7. *The promise of Isaac.*—Abraham thought that by the birth of Ishmael the divine promise would be fulfilled. This is evident from chap. xvii. 18. It was indeed a mere supposition, and we

must not regard it as an absolute certainty. His posterity, he thought, would participate in the promised divine blessings; and in mercy to his weakness God left him for a considerable period in this delusion. It was not till thirteen years later, a year before Isaac's birth, that he was undeceived; when God promised him another son, whom Sarai should bear, and who should be the inheritor of the covenant and of the promises. Abraham, already ninety-nine years of age, found it difficult to reconcile himself to this new idea. For thirteen years he had fancied himself in the region of the visible; and all at once he was transported back to the region of faith. God showed him the earnestness of His purpose by altering his name and Sarah's in reference to the renewal of the promise. The name in ancient times was not so distinct from the thing as it is with us. It was therefore much more moveable: a new position and a new name were closely connected. These new names were a constant reminder of the promises; a God-given guarantee for their fulfilment. Abram, the high father, the honoured head of a race, receives the name Abraham, composed of אב and רהם, according to the Arabic, "a great multitude" = the Hebrew המון. Sarai properly, *principes mei*, the plural instead of the abstract "my kingdom," receives the name Sarah, *princess*; as Jerome has very correctly said, "princeps mea, unius tantum domus materfamilias, postea dicta est absolute princeps." Both names emanate from the narrow limits of an obscure tribe, and pass over into the wide region of the world's history. They characterize Abraham and Sarah as persons of universal significance. From Abraham through Isaac there sprang first of all a single nation only; and the "multitude of nations" in reference to which Abram receives the new name of Abraham, father of a great multitude, cannot apply to this people alone; the less so since the question relates to a multitude of *Goyim*, which was more especially a designation of those born heathen. But this one nation was by adoption to be infinitely extended; it was at a future time to receive a multitude of nations into its bosom. To this the parallel fundamental promise in Gen. xii. 3 has distinct reference, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." They are ingrafted into the stock of the chosen race. It was only in this way that kings of people could proceed from Sarah, as is predicted in chap. xvii. 16. In a natural

way only the kings of one nation could proceed from her. It was because all this was connected with the birth of Isaac that the preparation for it was so solemn. And now since the birth of the heir of the promise, in whom as it were the covenant nation should be born, was so near, on account of the close connection of sacrament and church, circumcision, the mark of the covenant, was instituted, and is still retained in the Christian church in baptism, which only differs from it in form. To Abraham it was the pledge and seal of the covenant; and was designed constantly to give new light to his faith and hope, but at the same time also to his zeal in the service of God. Further details hereafter; we note only this, that the extension of circumcision to the servants was fraught with great significance. It pointed to the fact that participation in salvation was not confined to corporeal birth; and was a prelude to the later reception of the heathen into the kingdom of God. If reception into the chosen race were a result of circumcision; under altered circumstances, it must also be a result of baptism.

8. *The appearance of the Lord at Mamre.*—There can be no doubt that the three men who turned in to Abraham were in the writer's view the Angel of the Lord in company with two inferior angels. Neither can it be disputed that from the beginning Abraham regarded them as something more than mere men. His very first speech is addressed to the Lord. But from the first he was uncertain in what manner the Lord was here present, whether personally, or only in the person of His messengers and servants. A dim presentiment of something superhuman and divine was awakened in his soul by the majesty which beamed especially from the countenance of one of his guests. To Him, therefore, he addressed his requests and speeches. The presentiment which had been awakened by the spirit of God became clear consciousness when the stranger manifested a knowledge of his relations, which could not have been gained by human means, and foretold things which no man could foreknow; which was changed to certainty when the Angel of the Lord revealed what He was, and predicted the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha which immediately took place.

It follows from this representation that Abraham's conduct towards the strangers on their arrival, was something more than

ordinary hospitality. It was rather a proof of that fear of God which has a mind exercised to discern the divine and can recognise it even through the thickest veil; it was the lively expression of joy which every pure and pious spirit feels when it sees God, comes into close relation to Him and the divine. Abraham did not at first clearly recognise what degree of directness belonged to this view of God; and therefore his offering to his high guests is not at variance with this opinion; the fact that they eat does not contradict the declaration respecting their nature. Only the necessity to eat is opposed to this; the power to eat is given at the same time with the human form, and the fact that the possibility here became a reality had its cause in the divine condescension to Abraham's childlike standpoint. What love presented, love accepted. The eating of Christ after His resurrection is analogous, and the glorification connected with it, Luke xxiv. and John xxi. The meaning of this appearance of the Lord to Abraham is only rightly apprehended when its immediate connection with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrhah is kept in view. The mere repetition of the promise which has just been renewed, cannot be the sole aim. The judgment on Sodom and Gomorrhah was deeply significant for the future. It taught God's punitive justice more clearly and impressively than could be done by words, which cannot lay claim to significance unless they are able to make good their reality as interpretations of the acts of God; then, indeed, they are of the greatest importance, since human weakness finds it difficult rightly to interpret the text of the works without such a commentary. In that awful picture of the destruction, Israel saw in its own country the type of its own fate, if by like apostasy it should call forth the retributive justice of God. And the event is continually represented by the prophets in this light, not as a history long past, but as one continually recurring under similar circumstances; comp., for example, Deut. xxix. 23, Amos iv. 11, Isa. i. 9, and many other passages, even to the Apocalypse, where in chap. xi. 8, the degenerate church, given up to the judgment of the Lord, is termed spiritual Sodom. But the event could only reach this its lofty aim by the revelation of its significance to Abraham, and through him to his posterity. Only in this way did it leave the region of the accidental, of the purely natural. Only thus did

it receive its reference to the divine essence, and become a real prophecy. The intercession of Abraham called forth by the communication, and the answers which God gave to it, are detailed so amply, first of all to bring to light the justice of God, a knowledge of which formed the necessary condition of the moral influence of the past. God states expressly that neither arbitrary caprice nor yet severity, but only the entire moral depravity of the city shall provoke His arm to punish. But at the same time Abraham's fruitless intercession for Israel contains the lesson, that the faith of another can never take away the curse of one's own unbelief; and that even the closest relation between God and the patriarchs cannot protect from destruction the posterity who are unlike them; comp. Jer. xv. 1, where that which is here exemplified in deeds is thus expressed in words, "Then said the Lord unto me, Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be toward this people; cast them out of my sight, and let them go forth." The *Ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ ἐστι* which the degenerate sons afterwards urged in excuse for their false security (comp. John viii. 39), here receives its right explanation. We find in the history of divine revelations that great mercy is often accompanied by deep affliction. It is enough to draw attention to the parallelism of the *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* and the destruction of Jerusalem. Here also it is the result of wise, divine intention. Both necessarily belong together. By means of the one, the other is first placed in a right light, and its practical efficacy strengthened. The manifestation of the grace of God preserves from despair, and creates a heart for God; the manifestation of avenging justice guards against frivolity and prevents mercy being attributed to caprice. The appearance of the Angel of the Lord to Abraham, and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha, form a continuous, connected narrative. The curse is immediately connected with the blessing; and both are laid before the eyes of the future people of God for a great, decisive choice. If any one thinks that the Old Testament knows only a wrathful God, let him read chap. xviii. in connection with chap. xix. On the way to the divine judgments, divine mercy reveals itself yet once again in a glorious manner. "Depart from me all evil-doers," which the revelation of justice addresses to us, is preceded by "Come to me all," which has its basis in the visit to Abraham.

The condescension which led the Angel of the Lord to turn in to Abram's tent differs only in form from that by which the incarnate λόγος dwelt among us, ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (John i. 14), condescended to eat with publicans and sinners, and by which with the Father and the Holy Ghost even now He daily makes His abode in the low and impure habitations of our hearts. Comp. Apoc. iii. 20, "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." Again in the Gospel of John xiv. 23, "If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." It is impossible, therefore, to understand the one mode of condescension without at the same time understanding the other. For the formal difference has its justification in the condition of Abram, and in that which heathen antiquity invented of its gods. The imaginary form of revelation must have been one adapted to this time, if such a revelation were destined to take place in it. But so long as the heart is closed against the highest proof of God's condescension, this form of it must necessarily be regarded as unworthy of Him, and be treated with contempt. According to Gen. xviii. 33 the Lord went His way after He had left communing with Abraham. The hypothesis that He afterwards met with the two angels is without foundation. The angels speak to Lot in the person of the sender.

9. *The Destruction of Sodom.*—We shall first say a few words respecting the scene of the occurrence. Josephus, *De bell. jud.* iv. 8, 2, says, "Above Jericho lies a very barren mountain of great length. It extends northward as far as the boundaries of Scythopolis, towards the south as far as the country of Sodom to the limits of the lake Asphaltitis. There is an opposite mountain that is situated on the other side of Jordan, which begins at Julias in the north, and extends southward as far as Gomorrha, a town in the neighbourhood of Arabia Petra. The region that lies between these ridges of mountains is called the Great Plain, and reaches from the village Ginnabris as far as the lake Asphaltitis. Its length is 230 stadia, and its breadth 120 stadia, and it is intersected by the Jordan."

An extension of this plain, called the Ghor, in olden times formed the plain now occupied by the Dead Sea. Formerly

this plain was abundantly watered. It was watered not only by the Jordan, but also by many smaller rivers which now empty themselves into the Dead Sea—the brook Kedron, the spring Callirrhoe, the Arnon, and the Zered. Moses therefore compares the region with Paradise, which was watered by four streams, Gen. xiii. 10, and with Lower Egypt, which was exceedingly fruitful, and was watered by the branches of the Nile. Moreover the district was at that time full of bitumen, as we infer from Gen. xiv. 10, where it is related that the people of the kings of Sodom and Gomorrha, who were conquered by Chedorlaomer, had fallen into the pits of bitumen. Bitumen, therefore, was already buried there; or rather there were natural pits, sources of bitumen, before the sea was there. In harmony with this statement is the fact that even yet masses of asphalt often appear suddenly floating on the sea—Robinson, part iii. p. 164; Ritter, *Palestine*, i. pp. 752, 757—as this account would naturally lead us to expect, since the masses from the asphalt mines which are covered by the sea, must necessarily come up from time to time.

The natural condition of the district has received a remarkable elucidation, as it appears, by a recent discovery. The English editor of Burckhardt's *Travels* made the conjecture that before the destruction of Sodom the Jordan had its efflux in the Arabian Gulf. This conjecture was confidently laid hold of by others. The former bed of the Jordan, whose waters now lose themselves in the Dead Sea, they asserted was still in existence; and Burckhardt followed it from that place to the Arabian Gulf (comp. v. Raumer, *March of the Israelites from Egypt to Canaan*, Leipzig 1837, p. 7). But later researches, especially those of Schubert and Robinson, have completely overthrown this result. What speaks most strongly against it is that according to these researches the Jordan and the Dead Sea lie considerably below the water-mark of the Mediterranean—Schubert's *Travels*, part iii. p. 87; Robinson, part ii. p. 455. The Jordan must therefore have flowed uphill if it had emptied itself into the Arabian Gulf; comp. finally, Ritter's *Palestine*, i. p. 749. To this is added, that later observation has established the fact that the waters of the Wady Arabah in the rainy season all flow towards the north—Robinson, part iii. p. 34. Even Ritter, who de-

fended this hypothesis in the first edition of his *Geography*, remarks in the second, *Palestine*, i. p. 770, "At present it would certainly be impossible that the water of the Jordan could run uphill above the watershed height which rises between the south end of the Dead Sea and the north end of the Gulf of Ailah." We cannot follow him in his conjecture that the ground between the two may have become gradually elevated in the course of centuries. The most probable hypothesis now seems to be that which Robinson seeks to establish in his treatise, *The Dead Sea and the Destruction of Sodom*, viz. that already before that great catastrophe there was in the valley of Jordan a sea into which the waters of the river poured themselves, and which was spread over the whole valley by means of that catastrophe. The wealth of the cities in the plain of Jordan had produced the greatest luxury; and this had given rise to so fearful a moral degeneracy that the inhabitants were ripe for the judgment of extermination more than four hundred years before the other Canaanites. The mutual connection of the two judgments must not be overlooked. Just as the judgment on Sodom and Gomorrha was a most explicit warning to the neighbouring Canaanites, so it allowed that which was impending over themselves to appear in its right light, by drawing away the attention from the human instruments to the divine Author, who here accomplishes indirectly what He had there done directly.

It was by design that an opportunity was given to the Sodomites beforehand to reveal the depth of their corruption, which Ezekiel, xvi. 49, so graphically describes in the words, "Her iniquity was pride, fulness of bread; neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy. And they were haughty, and committed abomination before the Lord." In this way the thought of an accidental result was the more effectually excluded. It was not necessary to look for the cause of the event; it lay before their eyes. It was this also which clearly manifested the absolute justice of the divine judgment, of which man, owing to his innate Pelagianism, is so difficult to persuade. The prophetic signification of the occurrence was dependent on a perception of its absolute righteousness. God did not require the revelation of the sinful corruption of the inhabitants of Sodom; but for man it was

necessary, if the judgment were to serve as a warning example; and therefore with condescending love God caused it to become manifest. It witnesses to the highest degree of corruption that a whole city should have united to participate in a crime which only a few could outwardly perpetrate. Thus and thus alone did the fact become an express warning to the people of God, who, according to Jer. xxv. 29, were the more in danger of God's punitive justice if they surrendered themselves to sin, just because they were the people of God: "For, lo, I begin to bring evil on the city which is called by my name." We find an exact parallel to the occasion given to Sodom to reveal their sin, in the temptation of Abraham, by which he had an opportunity to reveal his heart full of love toward God and man. And the manifestation of grace follows in a way which places the divine justice in a clear light, showing that the love of God is not blind, but rests upon an ethical foundation.

In judging Lot, many have been led astray by the passage in 2 Pet. ii. 7. This passage takes cognizance rather of his ideal than of his historical character. It refers less to Lot as an individual than as a type, as a representative of those who are preserved by God amid judgments on a sinful world; a mode of explanation which must also be applied to what is said of Esau in the Epistle to the Hebrews. To be both type and representative, he must bear in himself essential characteristics of his counterpart. This is shown by the fact of his being saved. If there had been no good germ in him, if he had stood quite on the same level with the Sodomites, his personal relation to Abraham alone would not have availed to save him. His conduct distinguished him from the Sodomites; his noble hospitality, the sacrifice to protect his guests, his obedience to the angels, while his sons-in-law mocked the announcement of the divine judgment. What the Sodomites say of Lot, Gen. xix. 9, "He must needs be a judge," leads to the inference that formerly he had frequently testified against the prevailing corruption. But near the light there is also great shadow. We have already seen how the choice of his abode showed that he did not possess a proper horror of sin, and was therefore himself strongly infected by it. And the fact that we find him sitting in the gate tells against him; it was

the place where the whole city life was concentrated, and where much that was new was to be heard and seen, but at the same time much that was bad. He also appears to disadvantage in having betrothed his two daughters to inhabitants of the town of Sodom. We cannot agree with Chrysostom, *Homil. 43 in Gen.*, and with Ambrose, i. 1, *De Abr.*, in praising him for having offered to give up his daughters instead of the strangers; yet we may give him the benefit of Augustine's excuse, that the sight of the great danger had put him so beside himself that he did not know what he was doing. Doubtless he hoped that the Sodomites would not accept his offer, on account of the relation in which he stood to the most distinguished among them. But his tarrying in the city doomed to destruction shows how his heart clung to it and to his earthly possessions; his foolish fear, notwithstanding the guidance of God, proves that his faith was very small; and that later event showed him in the worst light of all. The disposition of his household also tells against him; his wife, perhaps a Sodomite by birth, so absorbed in earthly things that even danger to life could not withdraw her heart from them for a moment; his daughters so coarse that they do not scruple to employ incest as means to an end; his sons-in-law resembling the rest of the Sodomites.

With reference now to the process of destruction, many have sought to explain it in a naturalistic way by assuming that brimstone and fire are in the Hebrew tongue a designation of lightning (*vide* Clericus and J. D. Michaelis—the latter in his *Dissertatio de origine maris mortui*, in his *Commentt.*; the former in his treatise, *De Sodomaë subversione*). But this assumption has no certain foundation, and is contradicted by the words, "The Lord caused it to rain," which never occurs of lightning. And in Job xviii. 15, where brimstone is mentioned without fire, there cannot be a reference to lightning. The hypothesis of a proper sulphurous rain is the less unlikely since something similar has occurred on a small scale up to very recent times; and sulphurous fogs are only to be expected from the nature of the district, which has already been specified. In the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea are even now a multitude of sulphurous springs; fetid, sulphurous gases are evolved from the morasses on the shore, abundantly penetrating the

whole atmosphere of the sea in a very unpleasant way ; and on the coastland sulphur is to be found everywhere in fragments varying from the size of a walnut to that of an egg—Ritter, *Pal.* i. p. 760. The nature of the country serves to explain the origin of the Dead Sea. The fallen sulphur afforded a first material for the fire. It soon kindled the sulphurous masses and veins in the earth, and the whole crust of the latter was consumed. We learn the power of such fire from the account of Pliny, l. ii. c. 106; the Hephæstian mountains in Lycia burn if they are only touched with a torch, and so violently, that even the stones and sand of the brook become red hot. The waters of the rivers which had formerly watered the district now collected in the exhausted crater. Thus the Dead Sea arose. The conjecture of Michaelis that there had formerly been a subterranean sea seemed to be rendered unnecessary by that supposed discovery in reference to the Jordan ; but now again it assumes its right place, which, however, can only be that of an hypothesis. With it we may compare the already mentioned hypothesis of Robinson, that there was formerly a smaller sea which was extended by the consuming of the earth's surface. In Gen. xix. 24 only the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha is mentioned. But it appears from chap. xviii. that the ruin was to extend over the whole valley of the Jordan. In Gen. xiv. 2, Deut. xxix. 23, Hos. xi. 8, Admah and Zeboim are expressly mentioned. The conjecture of Kurtz that the destroyed cities are not themselves covered by the sea, but that their sites are to be found in the neighbourhood, rests only on a misapprehension of Deut. xxix. 23 and Zeph. ii. 9, where the point of resemblance to Sodom and Gomorrha is only the destruction in general, not the special manner of it. A French traveller, De Saulcy, thought he had discovered the ruins of Sodom and Gomorrha, and blazoned this discovery with great emphasis in the description of his travels. But not long after a cool Dutchman, the engineer, v. d. Velde, visited the same place, and at once perceived that the supposed ruins were natural rocks, and that vanity had blinded the eyes of the Frenchman. The memory of the event has also been preserved in heathen authors, but it is uncertain whether they are independent of the account in Genesis ; the contrary is far more probable ; almost

certain if we take into consideration the time of the authors; comp. especially Strabo, i. 16, p. 256; Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 5, 6, 7; Plin. i. 5, 16. The most remarkable confirmation of the biblical account is afforded by the nature of the sea itself, even at the present day. Comp. the excellent description in the first edition of Ritter's *Geography*; the second gives no description embracing details. It has so terrible a symbolical character that even if we knew nothing historically of that catastrophe, we must have guessed at some such event. "The desert," Ritter says, "which surrounds it formerly gave it the name of the Dead Sea, since, in the opinion of all ages, a curse rests both upon the sea and the desert so far as it extends, which has been strangely fulfilled. No living being, not even a plant, grows in it. Above it are sulphurous mists and pillars of smoke. Diodorus Siculus and afterwards the Arabs called it the Mephitic. Marcus Sanuto, who visited the Dead Sea about 1300, remarks, 'est autem hoc mare semper fumans et tenebrosum sicut caminus inferni.' The natives speak only with fear of the wildness of its shores, of the fruit in its district full of dust and bitter ashes, of the Bedouin hordes on the sea, who are said to be more greedy of spoil and of blood than anywhere else." "As the Jordan is no river, so the sea is not a sea resembling others on the earth. It is reckoned among them only on account of the outward appearance of a body of water, and of its mathematical dimensions—its nature is entirely different. It is wanting in all the charms which make the Alpine seas and so many others points of attraction; and in all properties by which activity, mobility, and the dissolving power of its element give a manifold character to the atmosphere—qualities which put the world of plants, animals, and men into increased activity, which make new transformations possible, and favour the life of nature and the intercourse of men. This sea-water is undrinkable either by man or beast; it nourishes neither plants nor animals; according to Hasselquist, the country round it is deficient in all vegetation, reeds do not even grow in the sea. The air of the district has not the softness and coolness of sea-air; and round about to a large extent there is no habitation of peaceful men, in the garden which once resembled the land of Egypt." With this description we may compare the prosaic one of Robinson, which serves to confirm it in every essential particular,

part ii. p. 448 *et seq.* He also says, "In accordance with the testimony of antiquity and of most travellers, no living thing is to be found in the waters of the Dead Sea—not even a trace of animal or vegetable life. Our own experience, as far as we had opportunity of observation, serves to confirm the truth of this testimony. We saw no sign of life in the water." Robinson, however, denies that foul mists rise from the Dead Sea. But an experience of five days is not sufficient foundation for this denial. The sea certainly presents different phenomena at different times. Comp. Ritter, *Pal.* i. p. 764. Parthei says, "Above the Dead Sea there is a permanent layer of vapour like an immovable wall, essentially different from the morning and evening vapours which are wont to form on the sea or inland lakes." But even Robinson finds complete barrenness and deathlike stillness of nature round about the shores.

The impression of the symbol is strengthened by its counterpart, the Sea of Gennesareth. Comp. the charming description in Ritter. In these two seas Israel had an earthly image of paradise and hell constantly before their eyes. It was not accidental that the Lord, who came not to destroy but to save the souls of men, chose the latter for the scene of his activity; neither can it be accidental that in the Old Testament there is express mention of the Dead Sea alone; the Sea of Gennesareth is only mentioned in passing; while the Dead Sea is not named at all in the New Testament. The symbolical character of the Dead Sea strikes us very forcibly in the passage of Ezek. xlvii. 1–12: a spring there arises from the new sanctuary, and soon becomes a great stream, which flowing to the Dead Sea, meets its waters and fills them with living things. The Dead Sea appears there as a symbol of the world lying under the curse, from which it is to be freed by the blessings of the kingdom of God in its future glorious development.

The narrative of the changing of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt has less difficulty in itself than has been introduced into it. A lingering was connected with the looking behind. Disobedient to the divine command from blind love to earthly possessions, she remained standing in the place doomed to destruction. The ground gave way beneath her; and she perished in the bursting fire, or was stifled by the vapour. She took the semblance of salt, for the whole district where

it was not covered by the sea, was covered by a layer and great blocks of salt. Even now the water has a very powerful encrusting power. "My boots," says Chateaubriand, "were scarcely dry before they were covered over with salt; our clothes, hats, hands, and faces were in less than two hours saturated with this mineral water." In the neighbourhood of Kerek Burckhardt saw from a mountain the southern point of the Dead Sea, which appeared like a sea full of islands and sandbanks covered over with a white layer of salt. According to Seetzen, the stones in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea showed incrustations like the brine-drops on salt; comp. Ritter, *Pal.* i. 649, 688; Robinson, part ii. p. 435, 440. In Luke xvii. 32 the Lord holds up Lot's wife as a warning example for those who, after having been called, become entangled in the judgments impending on the world, by their love of earthly possessions.

The transaction between Lot and his two daughters is excused by many of the church fathers—Irenæus, lib. iv. 51; Origen, *H. 5 in Gen.*; Chrysostom, *H.* 44; Ambrose, *de Abr.* 1, 6. To a certain extent even by Luther, whose observation, "Thou mightest, if God were to withdraw His hand, fall into like grievous sin," certainly deserves consideration. Here we see clearly how a false principle once accepted may mislead. Even granting that Lot was perfectly unconscious in the matter, which is not conceivable; his drunkenness, after what he had just experienced, is inexcusable. The daughters could not think that all men had perished; though this has frequently been asserted, owing to a misapprehension of Gen. xix. 31, where, however, they only say that in their loneliness they had no prospect of a suitable union; they had shortly before left the city of Zoar, which was not involved in the destruction. The reproach of an evil fabrication made by rationalism against the author of Genesis in reference to this narrative shows how little the biblical department has been investigated, and may be recognised as a calumny if we remember that the offences of the ancestors of the Israelites are recounted with the same openness. We have only to remember the way in which Joseph was treated by his brethren; to recall the like carnal transgression in the family of Judah, chap. xxxviii.; and the odium against the Sichemites, so severely reprimanded by Jacob on his death-

bed. And moreover, we have to take into consideration that the supposed hatred which is said to have begotten this narrative, is to be found nowhere else in the Pentateuch. On the contrary, the Israelites are earnestly exhorted to keep sacred the ties of blood by which they were connected with the Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites; to treat them as their brethren; to wrest not a foot-breadth of land from them; comp. Deut. ii. 3 *et seq.*, 9 *et seq.* Even the wickedness which the Moabites practised on the Israelites in bribing Balaam to curse them, and in leading them to idolatry and prostitution by his advice, is left unpunished on account of the bond of relationship: the avenging war is directed only against the participants in their guilt, the Midianites. It is just this interest of relationship which gives rise to the communication of the story.

10. *Isaac's birth and Ishmael's expulsion.*—Five and twenty years after the giving of the first promise, when Abraham was a hundred years old and Sarah ninety, Isaac was born. His name, *laughter*, he who is laughed at, the laughable, on account of the contrast between the reality and the idea, is very significant for him as the son of promise; whose birth, looked at from natural causes, could not possibly have been expected. In him the name belongs to the people of God at all times, for they are represented by him. Among them life everywhere proceeds from death; everywhere there is occasion for holy laughter; everywhere things turn out quite otherwise than could have been expected. A few years later, human sin was to become the means in the hand of God of separating the son of Abraham in a lower sense, and his posterity, from the chosen race which alone could call him father in the full sense, and of excluding them from participation in the promised inheritance. This was a type of the separation between the false and the true children of Abraham, which rested upon the same principle, and which, in accordance with repeated predictions of the Pentateuch, was destined afterwards to take place in Israel itself; a direct refutation of all claims having their basis in the flesh, even within the Christian church; comp. Gal. iv. 22 *et seq.* The conduct of Sarah is unjustifiable. Her hardness probably arose partly from jealousy, and partly from apprehension lest her son should at a future time be called upon to share the inheritance with Ishmael. For the sons of a slave

were not in themselves excluded from the inheritance. Jacob's inheritance was shared by the sons of slaves as well as by others. Yet the author passes no judgment on the motives of Sarah. His object is rather to draw attention to God's part and design in the matter. This, God's care for the chosen race, in keeping it pure from every false mixture, is the point of the narrative. Abraham here appears in the best light. What he refused to concede to Sarah from weak love, he did with joy when God commanded it, showing him that Sarah was only an instrument in His hand, that her subjective, sinful desire was in objective harmony with His will, that what she desired must happen if the divine plans were to be realized, making obedience easier to him by explaining that Isaac alone was in a full sense his son, and those who descended from him in a full sense his posterity. It was not cruelty in Abraham to allow Ishmael and his mother to depart so destitute of guidance and protection; but rather a firm conviction that the God whose faithfulness he had learnt to know in so many ways, would fulfil His promise here also, and protect the forsaken. Moreover, the hard form of the expulsion has a symbolical significance. It is intended to show distinctly the inadequacy of those claims to the kingdom of God, which have their foundation in the flesh, to set forth the necessity of subduing the natural inclinations, and to bring into clear light the distinction between the son of nature and the son of grace. After this object had been attained, the natural relation again acquired its rights; which, however, were but limited. Ishmael, along with the sons of Keturah by Abraham, receives a gift, comp. Gen. xxv. 6; and we find him beside Isaac at the burial of Abraham, ver. 9.

11. *The temptation of Abraham.*—The time at which this occurred cannot be determined. Those who have sought to fix the date accurately, have only followed their own fancies, or at most very uncertain combinations; those, for example, who assume that Isaac was thirty-three years of age at that time, in order to make the type more conformable to its antitype.

The task which God imposed upon Abraham is designated as a temptation at the very beginning, a circumstance which has raised doubt in many minds. James says, "God tempts no man," and the Lord Himself declares the same, for He teaches

us to ask that God may not lead us into temptation. But all the Lord's Prayer contains only inverted promises in the form of requests. The petitions are all in accordance with the will of God; and if He were in the habit of leading into temptation, we durst not pray thus. It would be equivalent to desiring Him not to do what is in conformity with His being and conducive to our good. But this difficulty is easily obviated. It disappears in the simple distinction between the two different meanings of temptation. In the first place, it denotes inner allurements to sin; in which sense it is used in the words of our Lord, "Pray that ye enter not into temptation." Then in the words of Paul, "But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts," 1 Tim. vi. 9. Here the falling into temptation appears a thing unconditionally evil, a state sinful in itself; in the wake of temptation are many lusts. Calvin says, "*Pravi omnes motus, qui nos ad peccandum sollicitant, sub tentationis nomine comprehenduntur;*" and in the same sense James also says, "No man can say that he is tempted of God." But temptation may likewise occur in a good sense, in which case it proceeds from God. He does not spare His own a battle with sin, but rather leads them into it by design; not wishing, however, to kill them, but only to further their advancement. He strictly proportions the trials to their progress; and far from inwardly urging them to sin, offers them power to withstand it victoriously. In this sense God's whole guidance of His people is a continuous temptation—He constantly places them in circumstances in which their inner state must manifest itself—which is the very highest proof of His love towards them. Without temptation man becomes stagnant; only in being tempted do we learn rightly to know ourselves. Trial eradicates all unconscious hypocrisy, does away with all pretence; by it we learn to know our natural weakness, and the strength we have already attained in God; by it, therefore, we acquire humility and courage, and are preserved from the two dangerous enemies of progress, pride and despondency. It is by trial we attain to a true knowledge of God; we are not really conscious of what we have in Him until we come to want it. And again, it is by trial that all our powers are set in motion; and the single victories which it enables us to gain

gradually establish a firm position. Of temptation in this sense Jesus Sirach says, in chap. ii. 1, "My son, if thou come to serve the Lord, prepare thy soul for temptation, for gold is tried in the fire, and acceptable men in the furnace of adversity;" and James, "Count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations; knowing this, that the trial of your faith worketh patience," Jas. i. 2; and in chap. i. 12 he calls the man who endures temptation in this sense *blessed*, for he says, "when he is tried he shall receive the crown of life which the Lord hath promised to them that love Him." There can be no doubt that the temptation of Abraham was of the latter kind. He was not tempted beyond what he was able to bear; this is clear from the fact that he withstood it. He does not encounter this most difficult of all his trials until he has first been exercised and purified by a whole succession of previous temptations, beginning with the command to go forth from his father's house.

What made Abraham's temptation so difficult was not only the natural love of the father for the son, but that in him were bound up all the glorious promises of God, which appeared to perish with his death. God's present command seemed to make void His former word, so often repeated, so solemnly ratified. How many specious pretexts were there for doubting unbelief and disobedience! It was because he cast aside all these pretexts, and raised himself above all visible things, "accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead," Heb. xi. 17-19; this made his victory so glorious.

As a means of obviating some of the existing difficulties which arise from prevalent conceptions of the divine command, "Thou shalt offer him there for a burnt-offering," the following remarks may be made:—(1.) It is certain that God commanded Abraham to offer up his son only as a trial, while he hindered the fulfilment. Hence it appears inappropriate to class this with the human sacrifices of the heathen. That there must be an immensely wide difference between them is evident from the fact that in the same book where Abraham's act is told as a glorification of his faith, the offering up of children is forbidden as a fearful abomination; comp. Lev. xviii. 21, xx. 2, and other passages. Such a combination appears unsuitable even if we regard this transaction as purely subjective. Bertheau remarks (p. 225) from his standpoint, "We see in the narrative

how Abraham already recognised the sinfulness of offering up children ; and in this respect also he stands as the forerunner of Moses and the Israelitish prophets." Ewald, "The highest trial of faith ends with the attainment of an exalted truth, viz. this, that Jehovah does not desire human sacrifices. It is certain that the contrary was at one time conceivable, and therefore to be attempted ; but even in that primitive time it was refuted by the experience of the greatest hero of the faith." And it is not to be forgotten that Abraham must have been unerringly certain of the command of God, otherwise his obedience would have been an abomination before God. (2.) We must also consider the relation of the command to the whole spiritual condition of Abraham. The command cannot be regarded as one which might still be repeated under certain circumstances. It presupposes a state of childlike simplicity. God does not prove the man who, from God's own revelation in His word, has attained a clear and firm insight into His will and law, by commanding something at variance with that law. It is impossible, however, to shut our eyes to the fact that these remarks do not entirely remove the difficulties. It is hard to understand how God, the unchangeable, can first issue a command and afterwards prohibit its fulfilment ; it can scarcely be justified, even if Abraham's undeveloped condition be taken into consideration, that God should, as a trial, command something which, according to His law, is excessively godless. But these difficulties disappear if the command of God be understood in a spiritual sense ; if we understand it of the spiritual sacrifice of Isaac ; a conception which is the more justifiable because the use of the expressions employed of sacrifice in a spiritual sense, which rests upon the fact that sacrifice in the Old Testament has throughout a symbolical signification, was a foreshadowing of spiritual relations, and runs through all Scripture ; comp., for example, Hos. xiv. 3 ; Ps. iii. 19, cxli. 2. Lange in his *Life of Jesus* (i. p. 120) appropriately remarks, "Jehovah commanded Abraham to offer up Isaac. Abraham was ready to make this sacrifice, but at the decisive moment understood it as if Moloch had said to him, thou shalt slay Isaac." It was by design, however, that the manner of sacrifice was not more clearly defined. The misunderstanding, though originating in Abraham and to be set down to his account, was still in accordance with God's

will. Whether Abraham could really make the spiritual sacrifice of Isaac demanded by God, would appear from the position which he took towards the outwardly-understood command, where all self-deception was impossible. When this result was attained, when the spiritual sacrifice was accomplished in the bodily, then God removed the misunderstanding, and explained that His command had already been fully satisfied, Gen. xxii. 12; thus indicating to His people at all times the sense in which alone He desires human sacrifices. We cannot object to this, that "go to the land of Moriah," pointed to a bodily offering. For even a purely spiritual act, a purely internal battle, may belong to a definite time and place; and the fixing of this particular place for the spiritual battle, had special reasons which we shall discuss later on. The objection that Abraham's false interpretation of the command must in that case have been expressly rectified, is also without weight. The rectification is given in preventing the slaying. If it be asked what then would have happened if Abraham had understood the command rightly from the beginning? we answer that this is supposing a case which would have been impossible. It was just because God foresaw the misunderstanding that He gave the command, that the correct understanding might be established for all ages. But the main thing is to keep distinctly in view the practical kernel of the transaction; its reference first of all to the covenant-nation, and then to the church of all ages. Only by this means we attain the proper standpoint for judging the external phenomena. God demands from His people the most complete self-renunciation, the sacrifice even of the dearest; and withal the most unconditional obedience. The father of the faithful fulfilled this demand, so justifying God's choice, and at the same time showing by what means His true children—even now each has his Isaac to offer—must prove themselves such. The covenant nation is a nation of sacrifice. According to Lev. vi. fire must burn upon the altar and never be extinguished. And the burnt-offering must continually burn upon the altar, the burnt-offering of the evening till the morning, and the burnt-offering of the morning till the evening. By this means the people were reminded that their being consisted in absolute surrender to the Lord; their destination in being ready to serve

Him. We have here the historical foundation of this Mosaic, legal prescription. In Isaac, Abraham himself was demanded, for his heart was bound up in Isaac ; and in the heart of Abraham the ancestor, was demanded the heart of all his true descendants. This is the practical meaning of the narrative, which is told with an affecting simplicity, vividness, and truth ; so that the history, if it is to remain such, can only be narrated in the biblical words. Nothing is more touching, yet without any apparent design to touch ; the representation is throughout entirely objective. Take, for example, the dialogue between Abraham and his son when they were ascending the mount together. By the way Isaac spake unto Abraham, his father, and said, "My father ;" and he said, "Here am I, my son ;" and Isaac said, "Behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for an offering ?" and Abraham said, "My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt-offering." These last words are very significant ; they show that there was a presentiment in Abraham's mind that God could and would bring about another solution of the matter than that which appeared imminent. Without this presentiment he would simply have answered, "Thou art the offering, my son." The typical reference of the event is already indicated by the apostle in Rom. viii. 32, in the words, "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all ;" which are a verbal allusion to Gen. xxii. 16. Abraham's love to God, which moved him to the complete surrender of what was dearest to him on earth, in and with which he gives God all the rest, is the earthly type of the love of God to us, who gives us in reality what He demanded from Abraham only in intention, not in accomplishment. The command contains an actual prophecy ; for the God of Scripture desires nothing which He does not give ; every demand is at the same time a promise ; He says continually, "I did this for thee, what doest thou for me ?" If He demand our dearest from us, it is only because He gives us His dearest. Abraham is desired to undertake the three days' journey from the land of the Philistines where he then resided, to the land of Moriah, the region about Mount Moriah ; and to offer up his son on this mountain. This direction stands in the closest connection with the inner meaning of the transaction. Mount Moriah was destined at a future time to become the most holy place of

the land, the place where God's honour dwelt, where He made Himself known to His people when they appeared before Him and did homage to Him by sacrifice. The primary object of the command was to give this place a primitive-historic consecration. The memories connected with the spot proclaimed aloud to every one who went to Moriah, "Offer up thy Isaac. It is not enough to give me what is external to thee, give me thy dearest." And the same place was to see the fulfilment of the promise contained in the command of God. The identity of place serves as a finger-post to the inner connection—pointing to the fact that both stand related as prophecy and fulfilment. Revelation loves to point to an inner agreement by means of outward conformities. Abraham's history here reaches its culminating point. Higher cannot follow. The object of earthly existence is that we present ourselves to the Lord as a burnt-offering; and Abraham had reached this highest step.

12. *Sarah's death*.—The most important thing in this event is the expression of Abraham's faith to which it gave rise. It is not without an object that Moses relates the purchase of the hereditary burying-place, so carefully and copiously. It was faith in the promise which guided Abraham in the whole transaction; and this cannot be better shown than in the words of Calvin, "He was not anxious to have a foot-breadth of land for the building of a tent, he cared only for a sepulchre; he wished to have a burying-place of his own in the land which was promised him for an inheritance, in order to testify to his posterity that the promise was not made void either by his death or by that of his people, but that it rather came into full force then." If Abraham had not been certain of the future possession of the land, it would have been a matter of indifference to him whether he and his were buried there or in the land of the Philistines; and certainly he would have shown no such anxiety for the burying-place. This anxiety presupposes that he had the certainty of not remaining always among strangers.

Abraham's solicitude for the sepulchre proceeds from the same reason as Jacob's express command to his sons, that they should take his corpse to Canaan; and Joseph's desire that the children of Israel should carry his bones with them in their exodus. The purchase was important for Israel also, as bearing witness

to the living faith of Abraham; and further because by this means notoriety was given to a place in the promised land, an occurrence which is never overlooked in the histories of Genesis, that the Israelites might always be accompanied by outward memorials of those in whose footsteps they ought to walk. Moreover, the cave of Machpelah is still in existence, built over by a mosque with mighty walls, whose entrance is strictly prohibited to every one not a Mohammedan. Yet in late years the Archduke Constantine of Russia succeeded in gaining entrance to it. The style of architecture points to a Jewish origin. Josephus relates that Abraham and his descendants erected monuments above the graves; and that the graves of marble, elegantly wrought, are still to be seen at Hebron.

13. *Isaac's marriage.*—What first attracts our attention here is the two-fold anxiety of Abraham, that Isaac should not marry a Canaanite, and that he should not be led back to Mesopotamia, the abode of his family, by marriage with a countrywoman. Both rest upon the same foundation, Abraham's faith in the promise. He charges his faithful steward to guard against these two contingencies. It is generally inferred from Gen. xv. 2 that it was Eliezer to whom he entrusted the carrying out of his design; but this is uncertain. The former of these anxieties is usually attributed to the corruption prevalent at that time among the Canaanites. But this was certainly not the principal motive of Abraham. Since the iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full, it is probable that a family might have been found among them, comparatively pure from the prevailing corruption, just as pure as the family of Nahor where idolatry was practised; and in which there was already a Laban to whom the gold ornaments and bracelets were the most important things in the matter. Abraham's aversion to a Canaanitish marriage for his son is much more readily explained on the ground of his faith in the promise. Seeing the invisible as though it were already visible, he endeavours to prevent every intermixture of the chosen and rejected races, from which at a future time unnatural relations would inevitably result. In the same way we may explain his prohibition to take Isaac back to Mesopotamia. He will not leave the post which God has assigned to him and to his race. He knows from God's previous revela-

tion that a long period still lies between promise and possession, during which his posterity will be strangers in a foreign land; but he knows also that the determination of the beginning of this period, and of the strange land lies not in his but in God's hand; that he and his race have only to wait quietly in the land of promise till the God who led them thither again give the command to remove. Again, we recognise Abraham's faith in his words to his servant, "The God which spake unto me, and sware unto me, saying, 'Unto thy seed will I give this land;' He shall send His angel before thee." He is firmly convinced that he and his race are chosen; and to this consciousness we may attribute his unshaken faith in God's special providence in a matter so closely connected with this election. To give glorious proof of this faith, and thus to awaken in Israel the consciousness of being chosen, and the consequent zeal to walk worthy of their calling, is the object of the great diffuseness pervading this narrative. God's providence toward His people is here so strikingly demonstrated, that even for us the history contains a rich treasure of edification. It is certainly not apprehended in its true light if it be merely placed in the universal rubric, providence and the destiny of man.

14. *Abraham's death.*—"The narrative of the pilgrimage of this great and devout man, the friend of God," says Stolberg, "goes out like a candle, and the latter years of his earthly life are lost in sacred obscurity." This need not appear strange to us, if we keep in mind the object of the historical representation in Genesis. We must expect *à priori* that after the culminating point in Abraham's life had been reached, after the temptation on Moriah, his life would become more like a calm-flowing brook which empties itself silently into the stream of eternity. There is a kind of conclusion in the words of God to Abraham after he had withstood this greatest temptation. The ratification and renewal of the promise which is now based upon a *because*, after God Himself had made Abraham worthy of it, stands in sharp contrast to the first giving of the promise at the going out from Haran, where it was only connected with a *therewith*. After the phenomenon in Gen. xviii. the words, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength," received actual confirmation in Abraham; and after Sarah's

death, as a solace to his old age, he took another wife of inferior rank, Keturah, who did not enjoy like privileges with Sarah, and whose children were not to be considered to the disadvantage of the heir of the promise, who had a rightful claim to everything which God had given to Abraham as the ancestor of the chosen race. By Keturah Abraham became the ancestor of many Arabic races, yet many of those named derived only a single element from them. For the usual idea that all these races are derived entirely from Abraham is quite false; as may be best proved by the Assyrians, Gen. xxv. 3, whose origin is in the main differently given in Gen. x. The relation to Keturah is mentioned only in connection with this descent from Abraham, else the author would have been totally silent respecting it; for it does not belong to the father of the faithful as such, with whom alone he has to do. But the interest in this descent has its root only in this, that according to the flesh they were allied to the covenant-people. Theologically it is a matter of perfect indifference. Kurtz is quite wrong when he says, "The descendants of Abraham by Keturah serve to realize the promise that Abraham should be a father of many nations." Those born after the flesh cannot be an object of the promise. It is expressly said, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." Among these nations the Midianites are best known. The greater number of them lies between Mount Horeb and the Arabian Gulf, and it was here that Abraham lived; others dwelt east of Moab, in Arabia Deserta, and according to Num. xxii. these were the people who combined with the Moabites in hiring Balaam against Israel.

Abraham is a very important personage, even if he be looked at from a completely external point of view. He is not only the ancestor of the Israelites, that is of their germ—for the descendants of Abraham's concubines are only to be regarded as supplementary—but also of a great portion of the Arabs and Idumæans; of the latter, with the same immaterial limitation which we have already made with regard to the Israelites: Esau, the ancestor of the Idumæans, took no inconsiderable number of servants from the household of his father. These limitations are the only true element in Bertheau's hypothesis, which is otherwise baseless, seeking to make Abraham in some measure from a person into a personification

of one of the Terahite nationalities who immigrated to the south-west of Asia, dominated by the modern effort to divide the property of prominent persons among the masses, the same historical communion which distributed the property of Christ among the church, as also the spiritual productions of a David, a Solomon, and an Isaiah. Moreover, all the three monotheistic religions derive their origin from Abraham. Even Mohammed showed great reverence for Abraham, maintaining that his own religion was nothing further than a restoration of that which the Arabs received from Abraham.

But his life receives quite another meaning if we regard him as the father of the faithful, according to Rom. iv. 11. And if this be the most important point of view, faith must form the essence of it. So much so, that those who are not able to understand this kernel and centre of his life must be mistaken in his historic personality;—for them the whole manifestation must dissolve into a mere vapour. Thus v. Bohlen represents the story of Abraham as a Semitic version of the Indian myth of Brahma; and Bertheau thinks that no accurate idea, no definite image of his exalted personality can be drawn from the traditions respecting him, which have only recently been put into writing. To him, on the other hand, who understands the faith, because he walks in the footsteps of Abraham, this story carries the proof of its truth in itself. It is remarkable how Abraham's faith rises from step to step—how the divine trials are always exactly proportioned to these steps of faith. God tries him by taking away, and also by giving. Under the former he is obedient, resigned, yet not cast down; the latter does not make him proud and overbearing. God takes from him his fatherland and his relatives. Abraham leaves his present possession rejoicing in the prospect of the promised inheritance; he leaves the future possession of the country of which he cannot call a foot-breadth his own, to the posterity of whom humanly-speaking he had no prospect. God takes away Ishmael, and Abraham obeys, comforting himself that the son of promise still remained to him. But even this comfort is taken away from him when he is more advanced, in order that he may henceforth have as if he had not. After having withstood this temptation he is in a position to bear the loss of his dearly loved wife with quiet resignation: to one

loosed from the earth the prospect of the end of his own pilgrimage was pleasant. God tries him by giving. Rich possessions accrue to him. Kings are conquered by him; kings solicit his friendship. And what is more than all, the King of kings condescends to him as He had never previously condescended to any mortal. He converses with him in his tent as friend with friend, a foreshadowing and adumbration of the *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*; a fact to which the Lord refers when He says, "Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and was glad," John viii. 56; and by reason of which James, ii. 23, terms him *φίλος Θεοῦ*, a name which is still the prevailing designation in the Mohammedan world. Altogether we are told of nine revelations which were made to him. What a temptation to carnal and spiritual pride! But Abraham retains his humility throughout. "I know that I am dust and ashes" forms the key-note of his life. From his example we learn how the fear of God is to be combined with love. It is this mission to which Isaiah refers when he calls him the God-loving, Isa. xli. 8. Like a grateful child he takes all gifts from the fatherly hand of God, using them as so many ladders by which to mount to the giver. From Abraham's relation to God, from his faith, arose his relation to man. Toward his wife Sarah he was faithful and loving; he had patience with her weaknesses, a type of the fulfilment of the demand made by Peter, 1 Pet. iii. 7; what was too heavy for her to bear, he bore alone. The fearful struggle of soul caused by the command to offer up his son, he concealed from her to whom God had not yet given strength to bear it. By his servants he was loved as a father. His faithfulness in friendship he proved towards Lot, whom he rescued with danger to himself. We learn how he lovingly and humbly recognised strange gifts and dignity by his bearing towards Melchizedek. In dispute he was just and yielding; in danger courageous and valiant; although accepting with gratitude even the carnal blessings of God, his heart did not hanker after riches; he generously refused the offer of the king of Sodom, and renounced his claim; he was simple and friendly in intercourse with all; with the Canaanites he lived on a peaceable and courteous footing, but at the same time with due regard to that retiredness which had its origin in the relation in which God had placed him towards them, and carefully avoiding

every union with them (comp. especially chapter xxiii.). His whole manifestation compelled reverence even from those of his contemporaries who were estranged from the Deity—so strongly was the image of God imprinted on it. King Abimelech was told respecting him, “He is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live;” and this prince confessed to Abraham himself, “God is with thee in all that thou doest.” The Hittites at Hebron called him a prince consecrated to God; and the priest-king of Salem declared him to be “The blessed of the Most High.”

Faith, the sun which warmed and illumined the life of Abraham, was not thoroughly developed into a firm and universal perception. But so much the richer and clearer was his direct knowledge. The more imperfect his apprehension, the more lively was his intention. In Ps. cv. 15, he receives, together with Isaac and Jacob, the name anointed, the possessors of the Spirit of God and His gifts, the name of prophet, of the men who understood divine inspirations in the depth of their souls. The series of these men was begun by Abraham, who bears this name even in Genesis, chap. xx. 7. In chap. xv. we have a remarkable proof how his spirit apprehended divine things by immediate contact with them; both the forms peculiar to prophecy, viz. visions and dreams, are here mentioned. The mode of his knowledge stands nearer to prophecy than ours. He pressed on from one degree of clearness to another, according as the gradual leadings and trials of God purified the mirror of his soul more and more. The same divine utterance of the blessing on all nations, in his posterity, had quite a different meaning for him when he first heard it at Haran, and when he heard it again on Moriah. He understood it in proportion as he himself had become partaker of the divine blessing.

With Abraham concludes a great section in the history of divine revelations. Schubert in his *Views of the Night-side of the Physical Sciences*, p. 156, says very beautifully, “When a great work is imposed on future generations, the Lord is accustomed to give a rapid survey of the plan and limits of the whole, in individual great men.” In the revelations to Abraham are contained in germ all that follow—his descendants, God’s chosen people, the land of Canaan their future possession after long and severe oppression, and finally the end of the whole,

the blessing on all nations, the multitude of nations calling him father, the King of nations proceeding from him. And what is of still more importance than these single apprehensions, in the leadings of Abraham the Lord has come forth from the concealment in which He had remained since the fall; He is no longer an abstract but a living God, no longer Elohim but Jehovah. In the beginning we have the fulfilment in germ. Everything which God did to Abraham is a prophecy of what should happen to every believer in Him; what He did for the chosen race is a prophecy of that which should befall the multitude of nations to be received into their community. Here nothing is dead. Every act of God is like every word of His, spirit and life. This actual prophecy is still daily fulfilled. If we had not the express promise of the Lord, He must still enter our hearts because He entered Abraham's tent. The history of Abraham not only reveals God's personality to us, but presents us also with the first type of a believer, in vivid colours. And from types we learn more than from commands and ideals; they show us that the divine life in this troubled world is not an empty idea which it is impossible to realize. The contemplation of reality in the past impels us to realization in the present.

It is very significant that the new principle did not enter into life through a single individual in the midst of a nation which was already formed, but became personal in the individual who was destined to be the ancestor of the chosen race. By this means it received an absolutely sacred primitive foundation, and at the same time became one of the most powerful incentives to walk in the way of the Lord, one of the most effectual means of reformation when the way has been departed from. The men of God might at all times say to the degenerate race, "Look at Abraham your father."

§ 3.

ISAAC.

Some of the events occur in the lifetime of Abraham. For Isaac was forty years old when he took Rebekah to wife, sixty

at the birth of his two sons, seventy-five at Abraham's death; Abraham therefore survived the birth of his grandchildren about fifteen years.

The events in Isaac's life are in many respects like those of Abraham's. This is owing rather to the character of Isaac than to a similarity of relations. Abraham, as the father of the faithful, opened the great series; in his guidances and spiritual peculiarity all that follows is typified and foreshadowed, and hence his inner life is throughout peculiar and independent; but in Isaac, who only carried on the succession, the inner life is throughout intermediate, as with Joshua in relation to Moses, with Elisha in relation to Elijah, and in some measure with the apostles in relation to Christ. The most suitable motto for his history is contained in Gen. xxvi. 18, "And Isaac digged again the wells of water which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father; for the Philistines had stopped them after the death of Abraham: and he called their names after the names by which his father had called them." We learn that his life is only to be considered as a continuation of the life of Abraham, by the fact that the promise respecting him, Gen. xxvi. 24, contains the additional clause, "for my servant Abraham's sake." His eye was so firmly fastened on his prototype, the powerful personality of Abraham made so deep an impression on the soft nature of his son, that he follows him even when imitation is reprehensible, viz. in representing his wife as his sister, although he was not able to do this with the same semblance of truth, or at least with less semblance of truth, for the relation was a more distant one. Yet notwithstanding all the dissimilarity in gifts, which was necessary that free scope might be given for the development of Jacob, the second primitive type of Israel; yet in the one main point Isaac resembles Abraham, in his living faith in the living God. Even in forty years he had not attained to such ripeness of character that Abraham deemed it necessary to consult him with respect to marriage; but none the less was there spiritual life in him. He had gone into the field to pray when his bride arrived. Afterwards he had not strength to conduct the education of his sons with a firm hand; but when his eyes were dim from old age, he had still power to bless, firmly

believing in the promise. It is significant that a multiplicity of types should stand at the head of the nation. In Isaac a pledge is given to those quiet passive natures who with a true mind keep the traditionary possessions of the church, that they also, with all their apparent insignificance, have part and inheritance in the people of God; that even a life which is not highly gifted, not endowed with extraordinary powers, may yet be good and blessed; that faith and truth alone are indispensable. Isaac's usual place of residence was on the southern borders of Palestine. This habitation corresponds to his character. The thronging and driving of the ever-increasing Canaanites was not congenial to a mind disinclined to strife and competition. He sought quietness and solitude. But even there he was obliged to suffer much injustice. What Abraham's awe-inspiring personality and energy had kept at a distance from him, Isaac surmounts by patient submission, and yet by God's blessing always overcomes in the end.

The birth of Jacob and Esau.—The twenty years' childlessness of Rebekah was destined to serve the same purpose as that of Sarah, not so much to exercise the faith of the parents as to arrest the attention of the whole after-world, to demonstrate that God was active in the matter, and that something important was in preparation. The divine revelation which Rebekah received when she had been disturbed by certain phenomena had a similar tendency. She had a presentiment of the symbolic significance of these phenomena; for she knew the promise, and, made observant by the long delay, she believed that here everything must be significant, even that which was otherwise not unusual. Therefore she goes to inquire of the Lord; in what manner is uncertain, probably by prayer, for that is the most immediate. If the asking of God by a prophet had been intended, as in 1 Sam. ix. 9, a nearer hint could not have been absent, since it is not at all obvious whom she should have asked. And no trace exists elsewhere of a prophetic gift outside the patriarchal circle. She was not deceived in her presentiment. The phenomenon signified strife between her sons, the ancestors of two nations; in which strife the younger was to overcome. The most important point in the narrative is that we here see how God's promises are not connected with carnal birth, nor inherited like human possessions after the

usual manner. The same thing is shown in the history of Ishmael with respect to Isaac, but more obviously in the present instance, since one mother was to bear both sons.

But we must not therefore assume that the preference given to Jacob was merely arbitrary. God's freedom of choice is only opposed to human claims and pretensions. The history shows that it was controlled by reference to individualities. Jacob is here related to Esau as Israel to the heathen. What Lange says of Israel as a nation, *On the Historical Character of the Gospels*, p. 9, is equally appropriate to their ancestor: "From their mother's womb, from their deepest fundamental life, they had already a predisposition to revelation, a genial inclination for true religion."

Esau's appearance at his birth symbolized his individuality. On this account it is narrated by the author, and for this reason it determines his name.

Esau is the representative of a certain natural good-nature and honesty, combined with roughness, passionateness, and unsusceptibility for the higher. He is without resentment or longings, a man who finds full satisfaction in the visible. Such natures, even when grace has softened their hearts, are not fit to be placed at the head of a development. One destined for such a position must possess not only faith, but gifts; but every *χάρισμα* presupposes a natural substratum, which is seldom found in characters like Esau's.

Jacob's nature is much more complex than that of Esau. In his heart are recesses and chambers difficult for himself and others to see into; while a man like Esau may be pretty well known in about an hour. He is soft and yielding, sensitive, susceptible of all contact with the higher world, full of capacity to see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending; but at the same time, like all characters where phantasy predominates,—Esau is the personified healthy intellect of man,—subject to great self-deception, open to strong temptation to impurity, inclined to cunning and craftiness, deficient in frankness. God put this man to school in order to free him from the great shadow which always accompanies great light, to that school in which alone some things are thoroughly learnt, the school of suffering; and when God's education is finished, then we see the individuality of Jacob,

which remains the same throughout, purified and cleansed from the dross of sin.

2. *Transactions relative to the birthright, or Jacob's cunning and Esau's roughness.*—The disposition of the two brothers is seen in their respective choice of a calling. Jacob chose the peaceful, quiet shepherd-life, conducive to meditation and contemplation. For Esau's rude mind his father's mode of life was not manly enough—he chose hunting. Even the ancients remarked the injurious influence which this pursuit exercises on the mind, as a daily employment. Jerome says, "We find in Scripture instances of holy fishermen, but not one of a holy hunter."

Isaac is unable to comprehend his son Jacob. He prefers Esau because he understands him better; because he is more adapted for daily intercourse. And Esau is more drawn to the father than the mother; is careful to minister to his smallest likings. His corporeal strength is pleasant to Isaac, who sees in him a welcome supplement to that in which he himself is deficient, a prop for his old age; in Jacob's spiritual power and spiritual wealth, on the contrary, there is something strange and uncongenial to Isaac. Here he stumbles on an element in which he is not at home. The subtle-minded Rebekah, on the other hand, is drawn towards her counterpart, Jacob; and she holds that she is the more justified in preferring him, since God Himself has already designated him the heir of the promise. In Jacob's cunning her tendency to intrigue finds a welcome confederate. She developed this propensity in the face of that obstinacy which in Isaac, as is so frequently the case, was united with weakness.

In the transaction concerning the birthright, the disposition of both brothers was clearly evinced. If the question had been of those rights of the first-born which were common to a later time, of the precedence in the family after the father's death, and of a double inheritance,—comp. Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.* § 79, 84,—then Esau would only have incurred the reproach of great recklessness; Jacob, the worse reproach of ambition and avarice. But in this case the possession was a much higher one. If, as Isaac afterwards assumed, the divine election followed the human claim, if the carnal birthright were to be regarded as an actual expression of God concerning the spiritual

prerogative, then the first-born was the heir of the promises, and was justified in assuming that at a future time the God of Abraham and Isaac would be his God also in a special sense; then he might hope his posterity would possess the land of Canaan, and that the blessing would proceed from them on all nations. Esau neglects all this, has no perception of the higher meaning; for the sake of a momentary gratification he gives up the highest possession, as the source so strikingly says: "And he did eat and drink, and rose up, and went his way: thus Esau despised his birthright." So he becomes the representative and type of those who for the sake of present worldly pleasure renounce eternity, and give up the real good for the sake of that which is apparent. For this reason he is called in Scripture (Heb. xii. 16) βέβηλος, a profane, godless man; but we must not fail to observe that this takes cognizance rather of his typical than of his historical character. At the same time, he must have possessed the root of such a godless disposition, otherwise he could not serve as a type and representative.

Jacob's conduct appears in another light, if we look at the birthright from this point of view; and we may infer that he himself thus regarded it, from the fact that he never made an attempt to appropriate the lower privileges of the birthright, never made any claim to precedence before Esau, or to a larger share in the inheritance. So long as Jacob was in Haran, Esau was richer and more powerful than he, as appears from Gen. xxxii. On his return, Jacob went to meet Esau with a humility which was almost excessive, in order to avoid all suspicion that he had such an object in view. We must also assume that he perceived how little his brother was adapted to be the bearer of a divine revelation, and, what is still more important, that he knew from the Lord's utterance which his mother had kept in her heart that the birthright was destined for him. But just because he knew this, he ought to have felt less temptation to act as he did. His act was the result of want of faith. For if he knew that God had destined the birthright for him, how could he conceive the thought of helping God, as if God Himself were not sufficiently powerful to execute His own design? A warning example for all those who would further the kingdom of God and their own position in

it by every kind of jugglery! The juristic maxim, *Volenti non sit injuria*, which is applied by those who wish to excuse Jacob in the matter, has only a limited application even in the juristic department—Esau might have made the complaint of the *ultra dimidium læsi*—in the moral department it has no claim at all. The words of the apostle, “Thou shalt not overreach thy brother,” are far more applicable. Jacob himself, erroneously connecting the divine gift with the carnal prerogative, regarded it as a matter which might be bargained for. But even human sin must be subservient to God’s plan. Esau now began to give up his supposed claim to the promise. He did this fully afterwards, when the father’s blessing, which stood in the closest relation to the promise, was given to Jacob. The narrator is solely occupied with God’s design in the matter. The actual judgment on Jacob’s conduct is contained in his subsequent fate. How remarkably this exemplified the divine *jus talionis* will be seen hereafter. But mark how, in the midst of all his error, the better element in Jacob shines out, so that he never ceases to be a subject for the chastising and purifying grace of God: he appears as a man of whom something may be made. He has faith in God’s word, and a disposition for God’s grace. Roos says with truth, “His faults are better than the virtues of Esau and of all worldlings.”

3. *Isaac’s blessing*.—The circumstance that we find Isaac already so weak that he must lie in bed, more than forty years before his death, is to be explained by his whole character. The less energy of spirit a man possesses, the more easily does he succumb to sickness, the more readily does he become a prey to disease, against which the will may do so much. His blindness also may in some measure be considered rather as an effect of this spiritual and physical weakness than the result of a definite malady. The mind exercises the greatest influence on the nervous activity. Of Moses, who was so full of mental power, it is said in Deut. xxxiv. 7: “And Moses was an hundred and twenty years old when he died: his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.” Thus the representation of Isaac’s character is consistent even to the minutest details,—a phenomenon which we do not find in any mythical history. His love for venison and wine is another indication of his character. *Abraham* places milk before his guests. The

consciousness of spiritual weakness leads a man to attribute too much importance to the body, and to seek strength by means of it. "Make me savoury meat" is truly a speech of cherished weakness, which alone can give rise to such desires; and if surprised in them, one cannot fail to be ashamed. In the transaction relative to the blessing, we must first of all draw attention to the fact that Isaac was not without considerable guilt. He perfectly understood the great significance of the blessing. He was penetrated by the consciousness of the special divine providence which presided over the fate of his race. He had a presentiment that in this important moment he should be a mere instrument. Such consciousness should have impelled him, with complete subjection of his own intention and inclination, to listen only to God's voice within him; the more since the earlier utterance of God was in unison with this intention and inclination. And, moreover, Esau's profane mind, and the religious indifferentism he showed by his marriage with Canaanitish women, served as a confirmation of this divine utterance. Isaac's conduct after the discovery of the deception contains an actual confession of guilt. He does not think of reproaching Jacob and Rebekah. In what has happened he recognises a judgment of God. Faith makes its way through the carnal prejudices which had held him in subjection. He looks away from the human means by which he had been led to act in opposition to his intention and desire, and rises to the invisible hand which has led the event to this issue. The sole object of the narrator is to draw attention to the overruling providence of God. Apart from this, what would all human means have availed? It would have been so easy to discover the deception. That it was God's design to give the blessing to Jacob, is shown by the circumstance that the deception was not discovered, and that the blessing was given to Jacob against the will of the blesser.

The fact that God employs these human means for the accomplishment of His plan does not justify them; otherwise every sin would seem to be justified. If Jacob and Rebekah had been persuaded in their hearts that God had destined the blessing for him, they must have believed also that God would find means and ways to confer it upon him. It was unbelief which made them think it necessary to frustrate the carnal

views of Isaac by human means—the same unbelief which in all ages has given rise to the maxim, “The end justifies the means.” The want of living faith leads man to put himself in God’s place. That Jacob and Rebekah estimate the end so highly, shows that there was a germ of good in them. That they chose bad means for its attainment, shows how much they were in need of purification. Moreover, we must consider that Jacob did not wish to appropriate the possession of another, but only to make sure of that which belonged to him, and which seemed in danger of falling into wrong hands. For this good end he made use of bad means. We must remember also that Jacob and Rebekah were not in the habit of putting their confidence in human means, so uncertain in themselves; but that they only wished in this way to prepare a substratum for the divine agency. It was this confidence in God which gave Jacob the boldness to answer Isaac’s doubtful question, “Art thou my very son Esau?” with the words “I am.” Otherwise he would have felt as Luther, who says of himself, “I would have run away for fear, and have let the keys drop.” The purification which Jacob and Rebekah needed, they received in full measure by means of heavy trials. The author, whose eye is fixed solely on God’s part in the matter, esteemed it the less necessary to pass judgment on the conduct of Jacob and Rebekah, since the actual judgment of God appears in that which follows. Rebekah was punished by the lengthened absence of her beloved son, which was the immediate result of this event. Henceforward he was as dead to her. She never saw him again, for on Jacob’s return she was already dead; as we learn from the circumstance that we find Deborah, Rebekah’s nurse, who would certainly not have left her before her death, in Jacob’s company on his return. How must her heart have been tortured with anguish in forming the resolution to take this difficult step! Jacob, who had grown up in affluence, must leave his home alone, in secret flight, and earn his bread in a strange land by the work of his hands. In his case the divine blessing is always associated with punishment. As he had deceived his brother Esau, his relative Laban deceives him by a striking retribution. As he had deceived his father, his sons deceive him in representing his beloved Joseph to be dead. That he did not err through ignorance of the divine law, is shown by

the fear he expressed, that if the deception were discovered he might draw down his father's curse instead of receiving his blessing; and still more by his anxiety, when after long years he again comes into the vicinity of Esau. The consciousness of having sinned against his brother first gives the true sting to his anguish. It is this which makes it so difficult for him to have perfect confidence in the divine help.

Isaac was 137 years old when he blessed his sons, just as old as his brother Ishmael when he died; whence Lightfoot concludes that it was this circumstance which led him to think of death. He died at Mamre, at the age of 180; comp. chap. xxxv. 27-29. We may now leave him and pass on to Jacob, who from this time forms the sole centre of the history.

But we must not omit to point out how exactly God's manner of dealing with him corresponds to the personal relation of Isaac to Abraham. Here we find nothing of the richness and fulness of divine revelations as they were imparted to Abraham. Just as Isaac's life was only a continuation of the life of Abraham, so also was the providence of God which was closely connected with it. Only twice was a divine manifestation granted to Isaac,—the first time at Gerar, where, in imitation of his father, he was about to go down to Egypt during the famine which had arisen in Canaan, probably with the intention of permanently settling there, and thus to realize before the time the announcement made to Abraham; again at Beersheba. God assures him that his posterity should possess Canaan, and that in him all the nations of the earth should be blessed. No new development, only transfer and renewal.

§ 4.

JACOB.

1. *Jacob at Bethel.*—The less progress Jacob had made in the divine life, the more he needed love as well as severity; and a proof of love was given him soon after his departure. A

position beset with temptation was prepared for him. Taken away from the land of promise, from the only circle in which the living God was still honoured, he was to tarry among a race whence the living knowledge of the true God had begun gradually to disappear; and with this race he was to enter into the very closest relations. The vision given to him at Bethel, the Lord in His heavenly dwelling, a ladder upon which angels were ascending and descending,—ascending in order to carry up to God his wants and entreaties, descending in order to bring him help from God,—represents that which was made known to him immediately after in words, viz. God's watchfulness over His chosen race, and over him first of all, who as the ancestor and head of it is here strengthened anew. In this symbol we have a prophecy of all the manifestations of a special providence until the time of its highest fulfilment in Christ and His church. Christ Himself expressly points to such deep meaning; comp. John i. 51. Jacob's surprise at the appearance of God in this place must be explained by the fact that He regarded not the universal, but the special agency of God, the manifestations of God as Jehovah, as confined to the place where His visible community was at that time. This indeed was generally the case; for Ishmael and Esau, in leaving the paternal roof, also left the territory of Jehovah. How comforting it must have been, how it must have filled him with gratitude and love, to find that God would hold communion even with an isolated member, if he did not make himself unworthy of this communion by his own guilt! Jacob was in a very susceptible frame of mind. He felt himself alone, forsaken by all the world, and his eye turned so much the more eagerly to the Friend in heaven. He feared that God also had forsaken him; so that the increasing love with which He now revealed Himself must have made an indelible impression on him. Now was laid the proper basis for the building up of an independent spiritual life in him. In that night he was weaned; formerly he was still spiritually at his mother's breast. At this time he first received a deep, heartfelt conviction, that if our sins be many, God's grace is superabundant. It was doubtless the consciousness of sin in a great measure which led him to doubt God's guidance and blessing. The place which for Jacob had become the gate of heaven,

was henceforward sacred in his sight. At a later period he wishes to testify his gratitude to God by building an altar. Now he only prefigures what he will then do. The stone upon which he has slept is made to represent the place of a sanctuary, to foreshadow the future. He anoints it with oil he had taken with him, after the Oriental travelling custom. Anointing is a rite of sanctification and consecration. The prayer-houses of heathen antiquity belong to a later time, and evidently owe their origin to this narrative. The name stands in clear connection with Bethel.

The vow of Jacob has often been stigmatized as mere compensation service. But let it be noticed that he only makes a condition of what God Himself has promised to do for him. If God did not keep this promise, he would not be God, and would therefore not be worthy of service. Mark also his modesty, which is contented with mere food and clothing. Let us not be more severe than God Himself, who demands only on the ground of His giving, who reveals Himself as *our* God in order that we may recognise Him as such, and honour Him by word and deed. It must be remembered that the manner of this revelation varies according to the difference of the times and the heart of the individual; that it must first of all be given externally to him who is still wrapped up in the external, in order that he may be led step by step to that which is higher. Again, the reproach of desire of reward arises mainly from a false rendering. It must not be rendered, "If Elohim will be with me, etc., then shall Jehovah be my God;" but only, "If Elohim, etc., and Jehovah be my God, then shall this stone become a house of Elohim; and of everything that Thou shalt give me, I will surely give the tenth unto Thee." Therefore Jacob does not make the service of the Lord generally, but only a certain outward form of it, dependent on God's manifesting Himself to him as God.

2. *Jacob in Mesopotamia.*—The centre of this whole narrative is the proof of God's faithfulness in fulfilling the promise given to Jacob on the commencement of his journey. He experienced this immediately on his arrival in Mesopotamia. It was God's guidance which led him unexpectedly to meet Rachel; and the same providence accompanied him during the long time of his sojourn in a strange land. True, he was

exercised by many a cross; for in him the saying, "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth," was strikingly exemplified. Laban's dishonesty involved him in bitter domestic relations; and his avarice sought to deprive him of the reward of his hard labour. But, by God's blessing, that which had been taken was virtually given back to him. We perceive the aim of the divine leadings best by their results. Jacob says: "I am not worthy of the least of all the mercies and of all the truth which Thou hast showed unto Thy servant; for with my staff I passed over this Jordan, and now I am become two bands." In this humble acknowledgment of divine grace we see what had been wrought in him by its means,—how he had risen to the Giver through the gifts, and had entered into the closest communion with Him.

Laban's character requires no delineation. Its principal features are avarice combined with cunning and accompanied by stupidity, which is often the case. Even religion he employs as a means to his ends. But his hypocrisy is too notorious to enable him to bring this to any virtuousness, which is only practicable if the heart be really on one side inclined to divine things. By this means alone does the other side gain material to elaborate its aims.

In Laban's daughters the evil influence which such surroundings must have exercised upon them is very visible. They exhibit unamiable jealousy of one another, whose mean and hateful manifestations Moses has copiously detailed, in order that polygamy, in which Jacob was involved by the power of circumstances, may be recognised by its fruits as opposed to the original institution of marriage. We find religious error so firmly rooted in them, that Jacob's influence during his whole residence in Mesopotamia does not suffice to free them from it. Rachel regarded the teraphim of her father so great a treasure, that she esteemed every means good by which she might obtain possession of them, and maintain it. Chap. xxxv. 2, 4 shows that Jacob's family also took other idols, ear-rings, and such like, which had reference to idol-worship. It was not until the family was in Canaan, removed from evil communications, when it was no longer esteemed necessary to pay honour to the local deities of Mesopotamia as well as to Jehovah, that Jacob succeeded in purifying it from the outward stain at least

of idolatry. Whence it appears that he received the command to return to Canaan just at the right time. Otherwise the tendency to idolatry would have become so firmly rooted in his growing-up children, that it would have been almost impossible to eradicate it.

The more difficult the relations in which Jacob was involved, the more beautifully does his faithfulness towards God shine out, and the better is the foundation for what God did to keep him in the truth. With reference to these relations, he incurs no other reproach than that of too great pliancy and softness. He was most to blame in yielding to the two jealous sisters respecting their maids.

In Jacob's conduct towards Laban we find traces of his old nature. Laban congratulated himself on the conclusion of the agreement that Jacob should receive all the streaked cattle which should be born without the application of artificial means. Jacob knew this, and hence resolved to fulfil the contract in the same spirit in which Laban had concluded it. His conduct cannot be justified, and therefore must not be regarded as the result of God's counsel, as many have assumed, misunderstanding the passage chap. xxxi. 11, which is not a command to Jacob, but only foretells what will happen, and what would have happened even without the human means applied, and for which he alone is responsible. But many excuses may be made for him. It was only his own property he recovered by a trick; which he thought the more necessary, since he could not seek justice by appealing to any power. In self-interest, Laban had sold him Rachel for the service of seven years, and had then deceived him respecting her, unjustly obliging him to serve seven years more. We learn from the example of Rebekah that the later Oriental custom of buying daughters from their parents was not yet universal, but was first introduced by that avarice which sought to turn everything into an article of commerce; for in chap. xxxi. 15 Laban's daughters complain of his conduct as manifestly unjust: "Are we not counted of him strangers? for he hath sold us, and hath quite devoured also our money." They protest against his having sold them; at least they say he should have given them the purchase-money for a dowry. After the lapse of the fourteen years' servitude, Laban, who was obliged to confess that he

owed all his riches to Jacob, concluded an agreement with him, in which, as he thought in his cunning, Jacob would fare badly. But no sooner did he find himself mistaken in this opinion, than he broke and altered the compact, and that repeatedly, chap. xxx. 7, 8. Jacob says to Laban, chap. xxxi. 42, "Except the God of my father, the God of Abraham, and the Fear of Isaac, had been with me, surely thou hadst sent me away now empty;" and Laban was unable to deny the intention, or to justify the means by which he had sought its attainment. For the rest, all that may be said either for or against Jacob is properly foreign to the unity of our narrative. The author has fixed his sole attention on the part which God had in the matter, and on the faithfulness of His promise, which proves itself here also; for if God had not blessed the means employed by the cunning Jacob always anxious to help the Almighty, they could have had but a small result, as all experiences which have been made in this department sufficiently prove. This was certainly not concealed from Jacob. He acted in faith; his object was not to help himself, but only to prepare a very small basis for the active efficiency of God.

3. *Jacob's wrestling*.—The appearance of the angel—which, as we are told in chap. xxxii. 2, gave name to the later town of Mahanaim on the other side of Jordan, north of Jabbok, on the borders of the tribes of Gad and Manasseh—forms a counterpart to the appearance of the angel at Bethel; and the analogy suggests the idea of an inner fact. Here, as there, the angels are servants of God for the protection of His own; here, as there, the sight of them forms an antidote to that fear with which the sight of the visible must have inspired Jacob. There God made known to him in this intuitive way that He would preserve his going out; here, that He would preserve his going in, the result of God's own command.

The same assurance was soon afterwards given him in a still more impressive way, at the time when his anxiety was greatly enhanced by the news that Esau his brother was approaching with 400 men; whence it is evident that Esau had already received his part of the paternal inheritance. Much light is thrown on the account of Jacob's wrestling by the passage in Hos. xii. 4: "He had power over the angel, and prevailed; he wept, and made supplication unto him." From this

it is clear that the weapons of Jacob's warfare were not carnal but spiritual; that it was in the main a spiritual encounter with God or His angel. In a mere outward struggle we do not overcome by prayer and tears. Apprehended in a gross outward way, the fact offers many difficulties, which Kurtz and Delitzsch have recently striven in vain to set aside. A spiritual struggle cannot, indeed, be placed in contrast with a bodily one. All deep emotions of the soul are shared by the body, and involve it in the agitation. We learn from the experience of one who was sunk in the depths of adversity, how heart and flesh rejoice in the living God; how, in one rescued from great need, the bones say, "Lord, who is like unto Thee?" Again he says: "O Lord, heal me; for my bones are vexed. Mine eye is consumed with grief; yea, my soul and my body." When the true Israel wrestled in Gethsemane, His body was so deeply involved in the struggle, that His sweat, like drops of blood, fell down to the earth. Hence it is evident, from the great violence of the wrestling, that Jacob's body was drawn into participation with the spirit; and this is decisively proved by the circumstance that the struggle had a corporeal consequence, and left behind it a bodily infirmity.

But the essence of the occurrence is infinitely more important than its form. What was the cause of Jacob's struggle? Evidently his great fear of Esau; comp. chap. xxxii. 7, "Then Jacob was greatly afraid and distressed." He knew his brother's fierce disposition; and when he heard he was approaching with 400 men, he thought he might anticipate the worst. Everything was at stake—everything which he had already gained, and his whole future—the possession of Canaan and the blessing on the heathen. This anxiety drove him to God, by whom it had been sent for this purpose. But God did not immediately condescend to him. He steeled Himself against him, acting as if Jacob had no claim on Him, as if by his sins he had wholly separated himself from Him, and could therefore no longer look for His assistance, but must rather consider how he should prepare himself alone for the danger which threatened. But Jacob will not be put off: his faith proves itself to be faith by the fact that he grows more urgent as God becomes harder towards him, and continually opposes him with, "Though our sins be many, God's grace is superabundant." Thus he obtains

that victory of which he and his people are to be continually reminded by the new name bestowed upon him. Jacob had been his name until then, because even in his mother's womb he had held his brother by the heel, as a prefiguration of his noble striving after the possession of the spiritual birthright, of his aspirations after the kingdom of God, which was grasped by wrong means only in the beginning, Hos. xii. 4. Henceforth his name is Israel, because he has conquered God in hard battle. The meaning of the new name, Israel, conqueror of God, is given in the words, "For thou hast power with God and with men"—with the latter indirectly. They were overcome in God. He who has God for a friend cannot be injured by any creature. Thus the highest claim which the ancestors of the covenant people had realized, and were destined to realize, was shown to be wrestling with God, perseverance in prayer, and entreaty until He should bless. This appears as the only but sure means of withstanding all dangers, even the greatest, while faith is the victory by which the church overcomes the world; and if from these struggles she bear a constant memorial of her victory, she is continually reminded of her weakness at the same time. Jacob is filled with fear of Esau: he is like a falling leaf; no human power avails in a struggle, which is the hardest, when our sins prevail over us. Israel, the wrestler with God, conquers the anguish, and is freed from danger. This event in Jacob's life is parallel with that which occurred on Mount Moriah in the life of Abraham. He prevailed over God not only for once. The name is given to him as a perpetual thing; thus showing that we have here the commencement of a continuous relation to God, that Jacob has mounted a new step, that this victory is the beginning of a series of succeeding victories already contained in germ in the first and having it for a foundation. But that he may not estimate himself too highly, he bears away a sensuous sign from the combat, to remind him of his weakness, and to convince him that his opponent had been at the same time his helper, that he had conquered God only by God. Such signs are borne by every believer from every struggle he has with God. Not one comes out of such an encounter without a wound. God allows believers fully to realize their own weakness, that they may rightly apprehend

how divine power alone is mighty in the weak. If, like the sacrifice of Esau, this event be looked at in its true light, as a prophecy, which ought to be and is realized in every individual believer and in the church at all times, it will be seen to contain a rich treasure both of comfort and exhortation. "For this reason," says Luther, "let us learn that these things are written for our instruction, that if the like should happen to us, we may know to hold God in such a way that we become Israel." That the event had a typical reference to Christ, the true Israel, is pointed out in Heb. v. 7: "Who in the days of His flesh offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared." God acted towards Him as a stranger as long as He represented the sins of the whole human race; but when, like Jacob, Hos. xii. 4, He pressed upon Him with strong crying and tears, He gave Him the victory, and thus laid a foundation for our victory. Esau's loving conduct was to Jacob the next fruit of his struggle, the next proof of his name. His taking the 400 servants shows that he had set out, if not with decidedly evil intentions, yet with the purpose of allowing his resolution to be formed by circumstances. From his passionate temperament, humanly speaking, there was everything to fear. But God put love into the heart that had been filled with hatred. The whole meaning of Jacob's wrestling is changed if we assume that Esau had previously had peaceable intentions, and that he had the 400 men with him for some other object, without any reference to Jacob. If the danger had been merely imaginary, how could God say that Jacob had striven with God and with men, and had prevailed? How could the victory over Esau's desire for revenge be represented as the price of the struggle with God? We need not say that the fickle and sanguinary character of Esau made it improbable that he should retain hatred so long in his heart. He was fickle and sanguinary only where higher possessions were concerned. Lasting desire of revenge was a characteristic feature even among his descendants; comp. Amos i. 11. They show a strength of hatred against Israel such as no other nation has ever shown. It continues as long as their existence. But in this case Esau's hatred is obliged to yield to a power stronger than his own, which stifles the flame of revenge, and fans to

a flame the few sparks of brotherly love existing along with it. It is plainly set forth that this decisive struggle forms a turning-point in Jacob's life. We see nothing more of his cunning and self-reliance. His trust is now firmly placed in God. But his old nature is perpetuated in his sons.

4. *The crime of Jacob's sons at Sichem.*—The consequences of this event, rather than the event itself, form the kernel and scope of the narrative. The author's eye is directed to the object which it subserved in God's hand, not to the human guilt incurred. The trouble into which Jacob was thus brought drove him nearer to God, and caused him to do what from weakness he had already too long neglected, viz. to extirpate from his family all remnants of idolatry that had been brought from Mesopotamia, and to consecrate himself and his household anew to the service of the Lord. The threatening danger gave God occasion to manifest Himself as a Saviour. In chap. xxxv. 5 it is said: "And they journeyed: and the terror of God was upon the cities that were round about them, and they did not pursue after the sons of Jacob." The narrator, who is describing God's dealings with Israel, is so absorbed in this his aim, that he leaves it to others to condemn the morality of the sons of Jacob. But we see plainly how little we are warranted by his silence in such a case to assume approval. The shameful deed is censured in the hardest terms by Jacob on his death-bed, chap. xlix. 5, 6; and divine punishment is predicted on Simeon and Levi, who, as sons of Leah and full brothers of Dinah, had been particularly active in the matter. The carnal pride of election, which already appears among Jacob's sons, is noteworthy. This election is made to serve as a cloak for their revenge; comp. chap. xxxiv. 7, 14, 31. It has been justly remarked, that we have here the type of those errors into which, in the course of history, many have been led by faith in the privileges of Israel rudely apprehended by carnal-minded men. The revelation of God vouchsafed to Jacob after this event, the ratification he receives of the name Israel, after he has again proved himself a wrestler with God—having passed through a struggle in which faith had conquered that despair of the divine grace in which the vice of his sons threatened to plunge him, the sight of the sins of the chosen race being the mightiest opponent which faith has to

overcome—form a kind of key-stone. He still lives for a considerable period. But now his son Joseph steps into the foreground: he it is in whose life the special providence of God particularly reveals itself, working through his destiny for the realization of its plans respecting the whole nation. We must therefore begin a new section here, after the example of Moses, chap. xxxvii. 2.

§ 5.

JOSEPH.

Providence appears so prominently in the history of Joseph, that it would be superfluous to draw attention to it in detail. It is more important to consider the final object which these providential leadings subserve. Why was it necessary for Jacob's race to be transplanted from Canaan to Egypt? For this is the centre round which everything in the whole section revolves. If the descendants of the patriarchs were at a future time to be adapted to divine aims, to those institutions which God through Moses wished to establish among them, they must (1) not split themselves up into small tribes, but form one nation, separate from others, and united in themselves. But this was impossible in Canaan. The land was already occupied by a whole host of Canaanitish nationalities. The number of the Canaanites was constantly on the increase. If the number of the Israelites were to increase in the same proportion, the necessary consequence would be, that they would either come to strife with the inhabitants of the land, in which they must necessarily succumb, and in which they would not have right on their side; or else by intermarriage they would become mixed up with them, and so entirely cease to be a nation, as the Sichemites proposed to Jacob; or, finally, they would become separated into single masses in the neighbouring lands. (2) They must be placed in a position in which they would not come into close contact with the idolatrous nations. Until now, God had bound the patriarchs to Himself by direct revelation, who with quick susceptibility had accepted this reve-

lation. But henceforward the direct revelations of God ceased for a long period: time was given to the scattered, noble seed to rise; the Israelites received their knowledge *indirectly* from God; they learnt to know Him as He who had revealed Himself to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But this knowledge and worship of God was not yet so firmly rooted, that it could not have been lost if their natural proneness as men to sin, and hence to idolatry, had been furthered by strong outward influences. And this would certainly have happened in Canaan, whose inhabitants, as we learn most clearly from the conduct of the Sichemites, had always been most conciliatory towards the strangers, always endeavouring to draw them into nearer connection. Moreover, they were destitute of all religious intolerance, which is explained by the fact that among them false religion had still a fluctuating character, no fixed forms and ruling priesthood; and that material interests preponderated, as was the case in later times. Out of love to them, the Sichemites were even willing and ready to submit to circumcision. (3) They must come into contact with a state whose culture, constitution, arts, and laws would present a pattern for imitation. A shepherd-life was best adapted to the patriarchs; as rich possessors, they enjoyed its advantages without being subject to its disadvantages. The simplicity connected with it must have made them more susceptible of divine revelations, which were still very simple, not requiring to be written down, and therefore demanding no literary education. Not so with a whole nation. Shepherd-life, as the mode of life common to a whole nation, is always connected with rudeness and barbarism: hence even now, the missionaries among nomadic nations use their utmost endeavour to induce those over whom they have acquired influence to make fixed habitations, and to cultivate agriculture. God wished to work upon Israel by settled religious institutions, to penetrate into the very centre of the national life by a complicated, and therefore written, code of laws. A settled religious constitution and developed legislation of this nature can only exist among a nation having settled habitations and a well-regulated civil constitution, and possessing some little knowledge of arts and sciences. Hence Moses afterwards founded the Israelitish state upon agricul-

ture, which partly presupposes such a civil condition, and partly induces it. (4) Already, in the predictions made to Abraham, the object of his people's sojourn in Egypt is said to be, that they might there be heavily oppressed, and be delivered by God's mighty deeds; comp. Gen. xv. 13. This formed the necessary foundation of that closer relation which God wished to assume towards them. Without the cross, no longing; only in a barren land does the soul thirst after God. Without the need of redemption, there is no gratitude for redemption. The way in which God deals with those nations and individuals whom He will draw to Himself out of the world is always this: He prepares trouble and anguish for them in the world; He arms the world against them. Therefore it must be a mighty nation among which Israel should grow to a numerous people—a nation which there was no human possibility of resisting. A mighty nation also, in order that God's glorious power in deliverance might be the more visible. This deliverance was to be for all futurity a mirror of the love of God to His people, of His omnipotence, of His righteousness in victory over the world; it was to be a prophecy of all subsequent judgments on the world till the final day of judgment: and how could this be, unless worldly power were represented as concentrated in the type of the world with all its power? (5) The kingdom in which Israel sojourned must also so far be fitted for a type of the world, that it must represent the moral condition of the world, its rebellion against the true God, its obstinate defiance, its foolish trust in that which is not God, in its own power and in idols. Without this, God's justice, and therefore His omnipotence and love, could not be fully developed. A nation still on the first step of retrogression, in which there were still remnants of the true knowledge of God, would have surrendered on the first attack.

All these conditions were at that time to be found in combination, only in the land of Egypt. In Egypt there was (1) enough of land not only for the descendants of Abraham then in existence, but also to accommodate the great nation which was to spring from them in accordance with the divine promise. Even now, besides the ordinary inhabitants of this prosperous land, who occupy themselves with agriculture, there is another race in Egypt, the Bedouin Arabs. These make use of the

pasture land in the neighbourhood of the wilderness, but at the same time often combine agriculture with pastoral life. Since, in Egypt, the state was at that time based upon agriculture, the large tracts available only for pasturage remained unused; and it was to be expected that the inhabitants would readily give them up to the Israelites. (2) In Egypt, the danger of mixing with idolaters, and the temptation to idolatry, were comparatively less. Although the national exclusiveness of the Egyptians was not fully developed till afterwards, it existed even at that time in its main characteristics, as appears from passages which we have already cited in another connection. Herdsmen are an abomination to the Egyptians; and it is necessary for Joseph to be freed from the ignominy of his origin by marriage with the daughter of a high priest. Among all nations of antiquity, none showed such hatred of strangers as the Egyptians, who used the word *man* solely to designate their own fellow-countrymen. On the very earliest sculptures we find contemptuous representations of foreigners, especially of the Nomads; and in many cases they are represented as suffering the most grievous oppression. Comp., for example, the sculptures on the temple at Medinat Abu, representing the return of Rameses III. from the wars of the east, in Wilkinson, i. p. 106. The inclination which the Israelites manifested towards the idolatry of the Egyptians, notwithstanding the repulsive treatment they experienced in Egypt, and the religious detestation which the Egyptians showed towards them, lead us to infer what would have become of them if they had grown to be a nation among a more humane people, such as perhaps the Canaanites were. Yet in the wilderness, when the Moabites and Midianites invited them to join in eating sacrifices offered to idols, and in fornication, they immediately succumbed to the temptation. (3) Among all states then in existence, Egypt was that in which culture had made the greatest progress, in which the arts were most advanced, and wise laws were to be found. Everything that Genesis tells of Egypt shows a rich, prosperous, and well-ordered state. The whole was founded on agriculture; we find a developed priesthood, an orderly court, high offices of state, a state-prison, numerous and costly works of art, etc. But the Israelites were not slow to avail themselves of the

advantages which such a situation afforded. At first, indeed, they continued their pastoral life; but as their numbers increased, they found themselves obliged to turn to agriculture and the arts. That the Israelites on their departure are not to be regarded as a mere shepherd-nation, is shown by passages such as Ex. iii. 22, according to which they dwelt in settled habitations in the midst of the agricultural Egyptians; also by the fact that there were artificers among them competent to prepare everything requisite for the holy tabernacle; by the manufacture of the golden calf; the spread of the art of writing; the circumstance that their collective public deeds could be based on a book, and many other things. The nation came out from Egypt entirely metamorphosed. (4) Egypt was at that time the most powerful kingdom of the world, the only one perhaps which had already a standing army,—a necessity for which was likely soon to arise, owing to its geographical situation. The fruitful land was surrounded by dreary wastes, whose savage inhabitants, intent on improving their condition, had their greedy glance constantly directed towards this paradise. (5) A Pharaoh could scarcely have been found at that time in any other part of the world; and yet a Pharaoh whom God could set forth to manifest His justice and omnipotence was necessary for the object in view. It was indispensable to such a perfect revelation of the nature of the world, the necessary condition of the full revelation of the nature of God, for such foolish defiance, such hardened obduracy; that the possession of the goods and the power of this world should ripen, evolve, and consummate that disinclination to God which already existed. But Pharaoh cannot be looked at as an individual; in him was concentrated the mind of the whole nation. The proverb, *qualis rex talis populus*, is also true if it be inverted. We have already seen how at that time, in Egypt, apostasy from the true God had reached its lowest stage, the worship of animals. The senseless pride of the Egyptian kings appears from the simple circumstance that they generally called themselves “lords over the whole world;” Champ. Br. 231. The address which King Rameses Meinamun, according to a monument in Thebes, makes to his warriors, is characteristic of this pride: “The strangers have been dashed to the ground by my strength; the terror of my name is gone forth; I seemed as a

lion to them ; I have annihilated their criminal souls ; Ammon Ra, my Father, has subdued the whole world under my feet, and I am king on the throne for ever." The apotheosis of kings, which probably first originated among the Egyptians, was a result of this pride.

These remarks will suffice for the main point. The author's aim throughout is to give prominence to God's agency. He shows how God can cause even the smallest things, the making of a coat of many colours, thoughtlessness in telling a dream which, as the event proved, had been sent by God, to be subservient to the most important ends. He shows how the sins of the chosen race may lead not only to the punishment of the sinning individuals,—even Joseph required purification ; the rust of self-sufficiency and arrogance had to be removed,—but also by God's undeserved grace be the means of salvation to the race itself, by bringing it nearer to its destination ; comp. Gen. xlv. 5, where Joseph says to his brethren, " Now therefore be not grieved that ye sold me hither ; for God did send me before you to preserve life ; " chap. l. 20. He shows how God, after having prepared a new dwelling for His chosen people, compelled them by hunger to leave their old habitation, which they would scarcely have consented to do simply at His command ; how Joseph, the type of his race, acquired in the house of Potiphar the capacity for his later calling ; and how by his residence in prison—foreshadowing the Egyptian slavery of the nation—he attained to this typehood, and so became the shepherd of Jacob. This is the author's aim ; comp. Ps. cv. 16 *et seq.*, where the point of view from which the whole narrative ought to be looked at is clearly set forth. It does not form part of his plan to judge of the morality of Joseph's actions. There are always moral and immoral people enough to undertake this. If, therefore, the judgment should prove unfavourable, the Holy Scriptures would remain quite unaffected by it. Since, however, it has become usual to express some opinion on the matter, we are not at liberty to remain altogether silent.

Special blame has been attached to those measures which Joseph, who occupied in Egypt the primitive position in the East of state ruler or grand vizier, made use of to increase the power and revenues of the king. Few have ventured to attack the historical truth of the narrative. For it has been

satisfactorily proved from other sources, that the relation whose origin is here given, continued to exist in Egypt long afterwards. In the sculptures, kings, priests, and warriors alone are represented as land proprietors; comp. Wilkinson, part i. p. 263. Diodorus says, i. p. 168, that the husbandmen built on the lands of the kings, priests, and warriors. It appears also from Herodotus that they occupied their lands only in fief from the king. He represents Sesostris (a mythical personage) as distributing the land among the peasants, who were obliged to pay a certain tax for it; comp. Wilkinson, i. 73, ii. p. 2. With reference to one point alone there seems to be a contradiction between Genesis and other sources. According to Genesis, there were only two classes of landowners—kings and priests. Diodorus, on the other hand, names warriors as well as these. But the more accurate accounts of Herodotus, b. ii. chap. 141 and 168, state that the fields of the warriors, though rent-free, were not their independent property, but were lent by the king, and were a substitute for pay. It will suffice to remind these accusers of the judgment of the Egyptians themselves, from whom Joseph received the name, “Saviour of the Land;” so, for example, the name Zaphnath-paaneah in Gen. xli. 45 properly means salvation, or, according to others, the saviour of the world, by which proud name the Egyptians used to designate their country (comp. Rosellini, i. p. 185; Gesen. *Thes.*); and to point to the genuine sympathy they manifested on the death of his father. But we may also discover some grounds of justification. The power of the Egyptian king before this time had probably been very limited. He received no regular taxes from his subjects, but only presents, or extraordinary imposts, which were no doubt obtained with great difficulty. Under the relations existing in Egypt, this was highly prejudicial to the state; the government had no power; and the most suitable regulations must fail for want of means. By the new arrangement the inhabitants lost nothing of their freedom or honour; only they were obliged to pay a standing rental, viz. the fifth part of the produce of their fields. This tax was very trifling in a land so universally fruitful as Egypt; and by means of it the kings were not only placed in a position to protect the land against hostile incursions which threatened it on every side, by the

establishment of a considerable standing army; but were also enabled to meet the enormous expenditure caused by diverting the Nile into canals, and damming it up. They were also placed in a position to undertake one of the greatest of human works, the forming of the artificial sea of Moeris, whose destination it was to receive the superfluous water of the Nile in years of extraordinary rising; and when the overflow of the Nile ceased, to water the land by sewers and canals, by which means the occurrence of a similar famine was for ever prevented. Thus the prosperity of the Egyptians was not diminished, but increased, by this arrangement. Michaud's treatise on the subject is well worth reading, *On Landed Property in Egypt*, in his and Poujoulat's *Correspondence from the East*, part viii. p. 60 *et seq.* of the Brussels edition. He has proved that, among all the fluctuating relations of government in Egypt, there has never been the same unlimited possession of landed property there as in other countries; and that the cause of this phenomenon is to be found in the peculiar relations of Egypt, where the fruitfulness of the detached piece of ground depends entirely on the universal measures taken to promote the fruitfulness of the whole land,—measures which can only originate in the supreme authority, since the fructifying power of the Nile, to which Egypt owes everything, can only be imperfectly developed unless these measures are adopted. We see this very clearly from the circumstance that, before the present change of relations, there could be seven successive years of famine,—a case which does not again occur in all subsequent history. Again, Joseph is reproached for severity towards his brethren. But this severity did not arise, as some have erroneously maintained, from a revengeful disposition. The narrative shows how much self-control it cost him. His design was partly to awaken in them a feeling of repentance on account of their shameful conduct towards him, and partly to prove them, whether they cherished a better disposition towards his father and his brother Benjamin than they had manifested towards him. Unless the result of this trial had been favourable, it would have been impossible for Joseph again to have assumed a nearer relation towards his family. When the object was gained; when they had come to look upon the evil which had befallen them as a punishment for the crime they

had formerly committed; when they had spoken that great word which the hard human heart is so slow to reach, "God has discovered the sin of thy servants;" when he recognised their better disposition from the circumstance that, in order to spare their father pain, they would have delivered Benjamin, with the loss of their own freedom,—then he showed himself to be a most loving brother, and sought to take away their fear of his revenge by attributing all that had happened to the divine causality: comp. chap. l. 19–21. We cannot fail to recognise the divine agency even in the crime of Joseph's brethren. God could easily have prevented it; but they were purposely involved in circumstances calculated to call forth all the coarseness and bitterness of their minds. This was the condition of their fundamental cure. Finally, Joseph is reprehended for not having sooner given his father some account of himself. But how can faults of this kind be found with a narrative whose whole tendency is such as to preclude the possibility of preventing them. We are able, however, to set aside this latter reproach. For here there was a religious element which served to obviate it. The author's object is to prove how the divine law of retribution is exemplified in the sons of Jacob—how the prophecy of his own fate is fulfilled in them, that prophecy which every crime done to others contains in itself—how the pain they had prepared for their father is repeated in them. But here Joseph is only to be regarded as an instrument in God's hand. The light in which his person appears is not considered by the author. The question is only of the personality of Joseph; and therefore we must be satisfied with what satisfied the author, assuming that it was God's providence which prevented him giving an earlier account of himself; because it was designed that Jacob should drink out the whole cup of sorrow, and that his sons should be punished, purified, and tried; as it afterwards happened. But we must also draw attention to the fact that, although Joseph appears throughout as a blameless, just, and God-fearing man, a noble character, and a peculiar object of the divine guidance and protection, he forms an essential contrast to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in one point. He was not favoured with divine manifestations like these, who were destined to stand at the head of the whole development,

and who possessed a special susceptibility for life in divine revelations; but, like his brethren, he consumed part of the capital already gained. It is true that he had significant dreams, and the gift of interpreting dreams; but proper revelations were never granted to him. And there is another difference which is closely connected with this. In the relations of the present life Joseph is far more dexterous and clever than his fathers; he is a man of the world, a statesman. In this representation of Joseph, Genesis is throughout consistent,—a strong proof of the historical character of the narrative. Neither does Joseph appear in any other light in the later books. For it is clear that Ps. lxxvii. 16, lxxx. 2, lxxx. 16, do not, as Ewald maintains, contain a different conception.

The proper keystone of the whole patriarchal time is formed by the prophetic blessing of the dying Jacob, Gen. xlix. His twelve sons, the ancestors of Israel, are gathered round him. In them his spiritual eye sees their tribes; instead of the Egypt of the present, he sees the Canaan of the future, rising even to the time when the promises of the blessing to all nations should be fulfilled, when the peaceful One whom the nations should obey would come and raise Judah, the tribe formerly distinguished above the others and from which He was to proceed, to the summit of glory, Shiloh, Gen. xlix. 10—contracted from שִׁלֹן, as Solomon from שְׁלֹמֹן: comp. the prophecy of Messiah in Mic. v. 5, “And this shall be the peace,” and the appellation “Prince of peace” in Isa. ix. 6. These last words of Jacob could not fail to make a very deep impression. They were the staff by which the nation was sustained in times of heavy oppression and persecution. The people also retained the remembrance of the prophecy made to Abraham of the 400 years; and the consequence was, that its realization was not expected before that time, so that the delay did not cause them to relinquish their hope. How confidently Jacob and Joseph looked for the land of promise, is shown by their respective injunctions respecting their bodies.

We shall here give a chronological survey of the history of the patriarchs:—

From the time that Abraham left Haran till Jacob went down into Egypt, 215 years elapsed.

The year of Abraham's call coincides with the year of the world 2083, B.C. 1922.

The year of Jacob's going down into Egypt coincides with the year of the world 2298, B.C. 1707.

Abraham was 75 years old when he was called; from that time till Isaac's birth, 25 years elapsed. Gen. xxi. 5.

Between the birth of Isaac and the birth of Esau and Jacob there was an interval of 60 years; for Isaac was 40 years old when he took Rebekah; and her childlessness continued for a period of 20 years. Gen. xxv. 26.

From that time till the death of Abraham 15 years elapsed, for Abraham died at the age of 175 years. Gen. xxv. 7.

Between Abraham's death and Isaac's death there was an interval of 105 years; for Isaac was 100 years younger than Abraham, and died at the age of 180 years. Gen. xxxv. 28.

From that time till Jacob's going down into Egypt there were 10 years. Jacob was 130 years of age. Gen. xlvii. 19.

Isaac was contemporary with Abraham for 75 years.

Jacob with Abraham, 15 years.

Jacob with Isaac, 120 years.

We get the sum-total of 215 years, if we reckon up the 25 years which intervened between Abraham's call and Isaac's birth, the 60 years from Abraham's birth to the birth of his two sons, and the 130 years of Jacob when he went to Egypt.

It is important also to fix the date of a few points in the life of Jacob, with reference to which no direct chronological statements exist. First, his departure into Mesopotamia. This took place when he was 77 years of age; so that we cannot speak of "the flying youth," an expression which we frequently hear in sermons. Neither can he be called an old man; for, owing to the long duration of life at that time, Jacob was only in the prime of manhood. Joseph was only 30 years old when he was brought before Pharaoh. On Jacob's immigration to Egypt the seven years of plenty were already passed, and two years of the famine. Joseph was therefore at that time 39 years old, Jacob 130. Jacob must therefore have been 91 at the birth of Joseph. Joseph was born in the 14th year of

Jacob's sojourn in Haran; comp. Gen. xxx. 24, 25. Thus we get 77 years.

A second point is the event which befell Dinah, in Gen. xxxiv. This belongs to about the 107th year of Jacob. It cannot be placed later; for it occurred previous to the selling of Joseph, when, according to Gen. xxxvii. 2, he was seventeen years of age. Jacob must therefore have been 108. Neither can it be placed earlier; for Dinah, who was born in the 91st year of Jacob, about the same time as Joseph, was then a grown-up maiden. Jacob remained six years in Mesopotamia after the birth of Dinah; and before the event of which we speak he sojourned for a considerable time in two places in Canaan, Succoth and Sichem. Gen. xxxiii.

§ 6.

REMARKS ON GOVERNMENT, MANNERS, AND CULTURE.

The power of an Arabian Emir differs only from that of a king in one respect, viz. that he possesses no fixed territory. For the rest, his sway is free and unlimited. It was the same among the patriarchs. A single glance at the history of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, suffices to show that they did not live as subjects in Palestine. Abraham had 318 servants born in the house, whom he exercised in arms; or, more correctly, he took only 318 with him to battle, leaving others for the protection of his herds. He had also a probably far greater number of other newly-gained servants. As an independent prince, he carries on war with five minor kings. He, as well as his son, concludes treaties with kings in Palestine as their equal. Jacob's sons destroy a whole city, without any attempt being made on the part of the Canaanites to bring them to judgment and punishment. The heads of the tribes exercised judicial power to its full extent. Thus Judah pronounces judgment of death on his daughter-in-law Tamar; and reverses it himself when he is convinced of her innocence. Gen. xxxviii.

The government of the Bedouin Arabs forms a good illus-

tration of that in the time of the patriarchs. It is excellently described in Arvieux' remarkable account of his travels, part iii. ; and again in Burckhardt's English work on the Bedouins, 2 vols. ; by Michaud, and Poujoulat-Lamartine.

Respecting the rights of the patriarchs we have but little information. It is certain they exercised many rights which were afterwards sanctioned by Moses. The Levirate-law prevailed among them: according to this, if a man died without children, his unmarried brother was to marry the widow, and the first son of this marriage belonged, not to the natural father, but to the deceased brother, and received his inheritance. This law was carried out with such strictness, that there were no means of eluding it, as appears from the story told in Gen. xxxviii. of Judah and his daughter-in-law Tamar. The root of this right or custom, which the patriarchs doubtless brought with them from earlier relations, lies in the want of a clear insight into the future life. An eager longing for perpetuity is implanted in man; and so long as this desire does not receive the true satisfaction which the mere doctrine of immortality is totally unable to afford, he seeks to satisfy it by all kinds of substitutes. One of these substitutes was the Levirate. It was regarded as a duty of love towards the deceased brother to use every possible means to preserve his name and memory. We see how deeply rooted the custom was already in the pre-Mosaic time, from the circumstance that Moses was obliged to make an exception in its favour among those laws on marriage within near relationship to which the custom ran counter,—an exception, indeed, which has reference only to one case belonging to the extreme limit. Only in such a case was an exception possible. In most, prevailing customs had to be reformed by violent measures. He took care, however, by the arrangement recorded in Deut. xxv., that the custom should no longer exist as an inviolable law, establishing a form under which a dispensation from it could be obtained. Polygamy certainly appears in Genesis; but only among the godless race, except in cases where there was some special motive: the patriarchs followed it only when they believed themselves necessitated to do so by circumstances, and the result showed that they were wrong. We are scarcely justified in saying that polygamy was not sin at that time, because there

was no special command against it. If this were so, it would not be sin now. Such a command does not exist in all Scripture. But it is given in marriage itself: hence polygamy is always sin, more or less to be charged only according to the various degrees of development. That the essence of marriage was understood in its deep meaning even at that time, is seen by the examples of Isaac and Rebekah; and even apart from these, it must necessarily follow from the religious standpoint of the patriarchs. Heavenly, stands in the closest connection with earthly, marriage; and upon this connection is based the prevailing scriptural representation of the former under the image of the latter. Only sons participated in the inheritance; daughters were entirely excluded from it. Laban's daughters knew that they had no part in their father's house. It seems to have been left to the father's option whether he would give the inheritance altogether to the sons of the true wife, or allow the sons of the maids to have a share in it. There was yet no settled custom in this respect. Abraham constituted Isaac his sole heir, and gave but presents to the sons of his maids. Jacob's inheritance, on the other hand, was shared by the sons of his maids as well as by the rest. But we must remember that in this case the sons of the maids had been adopted by the wives of the first rank.

The mode of life followed by the patriarchs was very simple. The wives lived in a separate tent, but quite near that of the men. The tent of the chief ruler stood, as it does now among the Arabs, in the centre of the great circle formed by the tents of his subjects. The nature of their tents is not accurately described, but we may assume that the description given of the tents of the Arabs by a recent writer will apply to it: "The commonest and all but universal tents of the Arabs are either round, supported by a long pole in the middle, or extended lengthways, like the tents of galleys. They are covered with thick woven cloth made of black goats' hair. The tents of the Emirs are of the same material, and are distinguished from those of the others only by size and height. They are strong and thick, stretched out in such a way that the most continuous and heavy rain cannot penetrate them. The princes have many tents for their wives, children, and domestic servants, as well as for kitchens, store-

rooms, and stables. The form of the camp is always round; between the tent of the prince and the tents of his subjects a distance is left of thirty feet. They encamp on hills, and prefer those places where there are no trees which might intercept their view of comers and goers at a distance. (In this respect the peaceful patriarchs differed from these waylayers. Abraham dwelt under the oak of Mamre at Hebron, according to Gen. xviii., and planted a grove of tamarisks at Beersheba, according to Gen. xxi. 33.) They choose places where there are springs, and in whose neighbourhood are valleys and meadows for the maintenance of their cattle. The want of this often obliged them to change their camp, sometimes every fourteen days or every month." See Arvieux, p. 214, etc. Although this mode of life is very troublesome, shepherd-nations manifest a strong attachment towards it. The Arab Bedouins despise all dwellers in towns, and are no longer willing to acknowledge as brethren those of their number who settle there. But the natural restlessness of man has a great deal to do with this prejudice. "It leads him to roam through field and forest." He who has an inward inclination to rest, seeks as far as possible to bring rest and stability into his outward life also. Even now an excessive love of wandering is the sign of a heart without peace. "*Qui multum peregrinantur,*" says Thomas à Kempis, "*raro sanctificantur.*" Among the patriarchs it is quite evident that nomadic life was only the result of circumstances, the natural consequence of their residence in a land in which property was in the hands of the former inhabitants. When it was at all possible, the nomadic mode of life was forsaken. Abraham does not wander in the district surrounding Egypt, but repairs at once to the court of the king. Afterwards he settles down in Hebron; comp. chap. xxiii. Isaac sojourns in the principal town of the Philistines, and occupies there a house opposite to the king's palace, chap. xxvi. 8. There he sows a field, ver. 12. Jacob builds a house for himself after his return from Mesopotamia, chap. xxxiii. 17. Thus we already perceive a tendency to change the mode of life. A partial change did afterwards take place in Egypt; and in Canaan the former mode of life was entirely abandoned.

The cattle-wealth of the patriarchs consisted in sheep, goats,

cows, asses, and camels; they had no horses. The breeding of horses was very ancient in Egypt, but was not practised in Canaan till late. In the time of Joshua and the Judges the horse was not used at all; it did not become general until the period of the Kings. Everything else which the patriarchs wanted, they either got in exchange for their cattle, or bought for the silver obtained by the sale of cattle. Silver money was in use even at that time. Abraham bought a sepulchre for four hundred shekels; and Abimelech made Sarah a present of one thousand shekels. At that time, however, silver was not coined, but weighed out. Thus, in Gen. xxiii. 16, Abraham weighs the purchase money when he buys a field. Even in Egypt, according to all accounts, there was no coined metal in use among the old Pharaohs; although it was common among the Greeks, Romans, and other nations of antiquity. According to old monuments, the Egyptians, in trading, made use of metal in the form of a ring. This was weighed in the act of contract itself; and therefore its value was decided according to weight; Rosellini, ii. 3, p. 187 *et seq.* *Kesitah*, mentioned in Gen. xxxiii. 19, was probably a similar substitute for a coin. It occurs afterwards in the book of Job, where it is borrowed from Genesis. Besides these, only silver was used for money: its name points to this purpose—*קֶסֶט*, derived from *קָסַף*; like *mammon*, which means confidence. Gold, though frequently mentioned, was used only for ornament. They had ample opportunities for the sale of their produce and the supply of their wants: since the Phœnicians, the oldest commercial people, lived in the neighbourhood; and the caravans, which took wares from Arabia to Egypt, went through Palestine, according to Gen. xxxvii. 25–28: comp. the confirmations afforded by the monuments in Egypt respecting the opening of trade between Arabia and Egypt, in Wilkinson, part i. p. 45 *et seq.* They exchanged or bought slaves, wheat, wine, gold, silver, woven goods, and pieces of cloth. We find many things among them which show that it was not in vain that they lived in the neighbourhood of cultivated nations. They did not hesitate to avail themselves of all the advantages and pleasures of culture: for we find no traces of nomadic barbarism among them—in mind and manners they seem rather to have occupied the standpoint of civilisation. The women wear

costly veils and rings of gold. Esau has fragrant garments, such as are still worn by the inhabitants of Southern Asia. Joseph has a coat of many colours, while Judah wears on his breast a seal attached to a cord, etc.

§ 7.

OF THE RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE OF THE PATRIARCHS.

On this subject there is, of course, little to be said. The life of the patriarchs in God was one of great directness: their faith was childlike. It is vain, therefore, to try to examine it in its separate doctrinal *loci*; just as useless as it would be to strive to point out in the germ the stem, branches, twigs, leaves, and blossoms; although they are actually present there. Only a few single points demand consideration. It is a very remarkable thing, that even in Genesis we find the distinction between a revealed and a hidden God which penetrates all the remaining writings of the Old Testament; and this is the case not only when the narrator speaks, but also when he introduces the patriarchs as speaking: so that the doctrine must be regarded as a constituent part of the patriarchal religion. We refer to the distinction between Jehovah and His Angel, מלאך יהוה; or מלאך האלהים, where the reference of the hidden God to the world, which is the medium of communication with Him, is of a more universal nature, or the author wishes to describe it only in general terms. This *Angel of Jehovah* is very often placed on a level with the supreme God, called Elohim and Jehovah, and designated as the originator of divine works. In illustration of this, we shall only mention the narrative in Gen. xvi., the first place where the Angel of the Lord appears. In ver. 7 it is said that the Angel of the Lord found Hagar; in ver. 10 this Angel attributes to himself a divine work, viz. the countless multiplying of Hagar's descendants; in ver. 11 he says, Jehovah has heard the affliction of Hagar, and therefore predicates of Jehovah what he had formerly predicated of himself; in ver. 13, Hagar expresses her surprise that she has seen God and still remains alive. Again, in chap. xxxi. 11, the Angel of

God appears to Jacob in a dream. In ver. 13 he calls himself the God of Bethel, to whom Jacob made a vow, referring to the circumstance related in chap. xxviii. 11-22, where in a nightly vision Jacob sees a ladder, at the top of which stands Jehovah. The Angel of God is thus identified with Jehovah. We find the Angel of the Lord so represented throughout, in Genesis as well as in the other books of the Old Testament. Many ways have been taken to explain this apparent identification of the Angel of the Lord with the Lord Himself, and at the same time to preserve the distinction between them. (1.) It is very generally maintained that the Angel of the Lord is one of the lower angels, to whom divine names, deeds, and predicates are attributed only because he speaks and acts by God's commission, and in His name. The principal defenders of this opinion are: Origen, Jerome, and Augustine among the church-fathers; among Jewish expositors, Abenezra; numerous Roman Catholic, Socinian, and Arminian scholars, especially Grotius, Clericus, and Calmet; among recent commentators, Gesenius, v. Hofmann (*Weiss. and Schriftbeweis*), who differs from the rest only in assuming that it has always been one and the same spirit who is the medium of communication between God and the chosen race; Baumgarten, Delitzsch, Steudel in his Old Testament theology, and others. But there are weighty arguments which prove that the Angel of God was not an ordinary angel, but one exalted above all created angels. Thus, for example, the angels who accompany the Angel who represents Jehovah, Gen. xviii., are throughout subordinate to him. And in chap. xxviii. 11-22 the Angel of God is also clearly distinguished from the lower angels. Jehovah, or as he is called in chap. xxxi. 11, the *Angel* of God, stands at the top of the ladder; *angels* ascend and descend on it. In Ex. xxiii. 21 this Angel is characterized as having the name of God in him, *i.e.* as partaking of the divine essence and glory. In Josh. v. he first calls himself the prince of angels, and attributes to himself divine honour. In Isa. lxiii. 9 he is called the Angel of the presence of the Lord, equivalent to the Angel who represents God in person. To follow v. Hofmann in giving such prominence to a created angel, is quite at variance with the position which the Old Testament throughout assigns to angels, and would have led to polytheism. In this case we

should have to give up the Old Testament foundation so necessary for the prologue of John's Gospel, and should lose the key to the explanation of the fact that Christ and Satan are at variance in the New Testament, just as the Angel of the Lord and Satan are opposed in the Old Testament: in the New Testament the Angel disappears almost without a trace. He is mentioned only in Apoc. xii. under the name of Michael. This is inconceivable if he were distinct from Christ, the guardian of the church; for the Old Testament has much to say of the Angel of the Lord. But the principal argument is the following: "The Angel of the Lord constantly and without exception speaks and acts as if he were himself the creator and ruler of all things, and the covenant God of Israel; he never legitimizes his appearance and activity by appealing to a divine commission; we find him continually deciding the destinies of nations and individuals by his own might, appropriating divine power, honour, and dignity, and accepting sacrifice and worship, without a protest, as something due to him." The assumption of a temporary interchange of the person of Jehovah is refuted by this exceptionless regularity. (2.) Others—as, for example, Rosenmüller, Sack, De Wette—try to make the Angel of Jehovah identical with Him, as the mere form in which He appears; "a passing transformation of God into the visible," as Oehler expresses it, *Proleg.* p. 67. This hypothesis, however, is contradicted by those passages where the Angel of the Lord is expressly distinguished from the Lord Himself. Thus, for example, in Ex. xxiii. 21, where Jehovah promises the Israelites that He will send before them the Angel in whom is His name; and in Josh. v. 13, etc., where the Angel calls himself the captain of the host of Jehovah, and is thus relatively subordinate to Him. The view is also at variance with Gen. xlviii. 16, where Jacob says, "The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads," where the Angel is spoken of as a permanent personality, and without any reference to a single appearance. Jacob traces all his preservation, and all the blessings he has received during his whole life, to this Angel; and claims his help for his grandchildren and their descendants. (3.) The only view remaining is this, that the doctrine of the Angel of the Lord contains the main features of a distinction between the concealed and the revealed

God or the revealer of God. We find this in perfect development in the New Testament, which makes known to us not only the concealed, but also the revealed God, who is united with Him by unity of essence, viz. the Son or λόγος, who was the medium of communication between God and the world even before He became incarnate in Christ, and to whom in particular belonged the whole administration of the affairs of the kingdom of God, the entire guidance of Israel and their ancestors. This view is the only possible one besides the other two which we have already shown to be untenable; and moreover, it has in its favour, that in all passages where the Angel of the Lord is spoken of, the unanimous tradition of the Jews makes him the one mediator between God and the world, the originator of all revelation, to whom they give the name *Metatron*. It may be regarded as that which generally prevails in the Christian church. All the church-fathers, with the exception of those already named, were in favour of it; and it has been defended by almost all theologians of the two evangelical churches. Here arises the question, How does the doctrine of the Messenger of God related to Elohim and Jehovah, already belong to the patriarchal consciousness? At the first glance it seems as if God were related to His Messenger as Elohim to Jehovah. But on nearer consideration the difference becomes apparent. The distinction between Jehovah and Elohim has reference not to being, but to knowing: Elohim is the concealed Jehovah, Jehovah the revealed Elohim; whence it is evident that the use of Elohim preponderates only in Genesis, at the time of the gradual transition to a developed consciousness of God; and, on the other hand, falls completely into the background in the later books of the Pentateuch. The difference between Jehovah and Elohim has its basis solely and entirely in the distinction between the developed and the undeveloped God-consciousness. It contains no intimation of the doctrine of a diversity of persons in one divine substance. Elohim and Jehovah both refer to the whole divine essence. On the contrary, the doctrine of the *מלאך יהוה* or *האלהים* has reference to inner relations of the Godhead. It is the first step towards the distinction of a plurality of persons in the one divine nature; against which we cannot urge similarity of name to the created servants of God. For

this common name has reference not to essence, but only to office. While the difference between Elohim and Jehovah gradually disappears, Elohim becoming more and more Jehovah, the difference between God and his Angel is by degrees more and more sharply defined, till at last it is definitely shown to be that of Father and Son. In this way it loses its fluctuating character, that of a mere difference of relations, which it always more or less maintained under the Old Testament, because the main thing there was to uphold the doctrine of the unity of God in opposition to polytheism, and because it was impossible to apprehend more deeply the relation existing between Father and Son till the incarnation of Christ. The existence of the revelation-trinity forms the necessary foundation for rightly understanding the trinity of essence. There is only one more fact to which we shall draw attention, viz. that in the book of Daniel, and in Apoc. xii., the Angel of the Lord appears under the name of Michael. This name—who is like God, whose glory is represented in me—is an exact designation of the essence; a limitation of his sphere against that of all other angels. It rests upon Ex. xv. 11, “Who is like unto Thee, O Lord, among the gods?” and on Ps. lxxxix. 7, 8. It denotes the *εἶναι ἰσα Θεῷ* which is predicated of Christ in John v. 18, Phil. ii. 6. We shall now proceed to point out the causes which led to erroneous views respecting the Angel of the Lord. Among Catholic theologians, it was interest for the worship of Angels; among Socinians and Arminians, it was a disinclination to the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity; among many recent writers, it is due to an exaggerated aversion to the old identification of Old and New Testament doctrine.

How far the patriarchs associated this doctrine of the revealer of God with their Messianic views, cannot be accurately determined. The immediate was so predominant among them, that they must undoubtedly have guessed far more than they clearly understood. But before we can come to any decision respecting this combination, we must first give a sketch of the peerings into the future granted to the patriarchs.

The first human pair, after their fall, received an indefinite promise of future restoration, of conquest over sin, and deliverance from the evil connected with it. How the burden of sin and evil impelled the better among the first men to cling to

this promise, inscribing it on their hearts in ineffaceable characters, and how their longing was constantly directed to its fulfilment, is shown by the saying of Noah's parents on his birth, Gen. v. 29. They hoped that the son who was given to them should be the instrument by which God would realize His promise of the blessing which was to follow the curse, if not in its full comprehension, yet in its beginning. And they were not deceived in this hope. In the grace which God showed to Noah and his race the promise certainly did not fail, but received a beginning of its fulfilment, which was at the same time a pledge and prediction of a far more glorious accomplishment. An indication of this was contained in the prophetic announcement of Noah, Gen. ix. 26, 27. God promises to enter into a close union with the race of Shem; and the descendants of the other son, Japhet, are also at some future time to participate in the fulness of this blessing. This was the extent of the glimpse into the future at the time when Abraham appeared. An entirely new basis was now given to the hope, even apart from the verbal renewal and more exact determination of the promise. In the leadings of the patriarchs, the living God manifested Himself in a way never anticipated before. The heavens which had been closed since the fall re-opened, and the angels of God again ascended and descended. What God promises for the future, gains significance only in proportion as He makes Himself known in the present. Promises heaped upon promises float in the air, and do not come nigh the heart. What God promised to the patriarchs, received its significance by that which God granted them.

These promises are closely connected with those which preceded them. The revelation of a closer union of God with the race of Shem is more nearly defined by the promise that among this race the posterity of Abraham should come into closer communion with God through Isaac, and the posterity of Isaac again through Jacob. God promises to give them the land of Canaan for a possession, to come forth more and more from His concealment, and to assume a more definite form. The promise that Japhet should dwell in the tents of Shem is also renewed. What God pledges Himself to do for a single people, has final reference to the whole human race. Through the posterity of the patriarchs all nations of the earth are to

be blessed ; through them the curse is to be removed which has rested upon the whole earth since the fall of the first man. In this particular the renewal is also a continuation. In chap. ix., participation in the blessing is promised only to Shem and Japhet ; in this connection, no prospect of a joyful future is opened out to Ham. In the promise to the patriarchs, on the contrary, the blessing is always extended to all nations of the earth. With reference to the manner of the blessing, a new disclosure was given in the blessing of the dying Jacob. From Judah's stem a great dispenser of blessings is to go forth ; and on Him, as the King of the whole earth, the nations will depend. As Gen. iii. is the first Gospel in a wide sense ; so Gen. xlix. is the first Gospel in a narrower sense : Shiloh is the first name of the Redeemer.

Let us now return to the question, In what relation do the expectations of the patriarchs respecting the future stand to their knowledge of the λόγος ? All the graces bestowed on them by God they recognised as coming through the Angel of the Lord. It was he who entered Abraham's tent ; who allowed himself to be overcome by Jacob, by means of the power he himself had given him ; whom Jacob, when near death, extolled as his deliverer from all need ; and to whose guardianship, as the redeemer from all evil, he commended the sons of Joseph, Gen. xlviii. 14-16. Since, therefore, the Angel of the Lord is expressly named in a series of announcements to the patriarchs ; since Jacob, in another place, derives all the assurances which he has experienced from this Angel ; since Hosea, in chap. xii. 5, represents Jacob as wrestling with the Angel, while in Genesis we are told of his encounter with Elohim ; and since in Gen. xxxi. 11 the Angel of God arrogates to himself that which in chap. xxviii. is attributed to Jehovah,—we are fully justified in assuming that all revelations of God to the patriarchs were given through the medium of the Angel of the Lord ; that wherever manifestations of Jehovah are spoken of, they must always be regarded as having taken place “in His Angel ;” that Jehovah does not form the antithesis to the Angel of Jehovah, but is only the general designation of the divine essence, which is brought near by the Angel. If the Lord generally converses with His own through the medium of His Angel, He must do

so always. For the reason why He does so generally can only lie in the fact that His nature requires this mediation; and if the Angel of the Lord had done such infinitely glorious things for believers in the present, why should they not also expect him to be the mediator of all future graces? To determine whether this mediation would concentrate itself in a personal appearance of the Angel of Jehovah, whether he would be bodily represented in the Prince of Peace from Judah's stem, lay beyond the sphere of their lower knowledge. But in the meantime it formed a basis for that higher illumination which was vouchsafed to them in moments when they were filled with the Spirit of God. If the Angel of the Lord appeared to Abraham for an inferior aim, what might they not expect when the highest of all aims would be realized, and the whole earth freed from its curse? We do not find the clear and sharply-defined knowledge of the mediation of the Messianic salvation through the Angel of the Lord until very late, in the post-exile prophets Zechariah and Malachi. Those passages, properly classic, are Zech. xi. and xiii. 7, and Mal. iii. 1.

What has been said respecting the doctrine of the Messiah, holds good also of the doctrine of immortality and retribution, among the patriarchs. In their direct consciousness, the belief in immortality was given as certainly as they themselves had passed from death to life. Only he who has experienced this change has the certainty of a blessed immortality; and where this is the case, it exists without exception. All God's dealings with the patriarchs were calculated to strengthen direct trust. In Matt. xxii. 23 *et seq.*, the Saviour shows, in opposition to the Sadducees, how all the Lord's dealings with them were a prophecy of their resurrection. If man be *only* dust and ashes, how should God deign thus to accept him for His own? What lies at the basis of Abraham's readiness to offer up his son, is the confidence that God was able even to raise him up from the dead (Heb. xi. 19), founded on a real, not a lifeless, knowledge of His unbounded omnipotence, which, when connected with a true perception of the divine love, must necessarily beget the hope of resurrection. In general, the patriarchs held aloof from all subtle inquiries on a subject respecting which God had not given them more definite disclosures. Their aim was to surrender themselves, body and

soul, unconditionally to God, and quietly to await His will respecting them. Some have sought to find a definite expression of hope in the words of the dying Jacob, Gen. xlix. 18 : "I have waited for Thy salvation, O Lord." But the context shows that this has reference rather to that salvation which God had promised to Jacob for his race, the salvation to which the whole blessing has reference. But it is significant that the account of Enoch's translation, in consequence of his walk with God, must have come to Moses through the medium of the patriarchs. This circumstance showed them that there was an everlasting blessed life for the pious; and that the more closely they felt themselves united to God, the more able they would be to appropriate the actual promise thus given to them. These remarks have reference to the doctrine of eternal life; belief in mere immortality was common even to the lower knowledge of the patriarchs; as is shown by a whole host of passages, which we take for granted are well known. The idea of annihilation and the cessation of all individual life, is quite foreign to the Old Testament. The foreground, the sojourn in Sheol—derived from שָׁאֵל, to ask, the ever-desiring, drawing all life to itself—is very clearly recognised even in the time of the patriarchs. But a veil rested on that which lies beyond Sheol. It was not yet clearly understood that Sheol was only an intermediate state. But the more the patriarchs had decidedly the disadvantage of us with regard to a clear knowledge of the future life—for in this respect they lacked all revelation of God—the more ought we to be edified by their living faith, which was ready for every sacrifice; the more deeply must they put us to shame, since we possess the solution of so many of the problems of this earthly life, of so many difficulties which interfere with a clear insight into the future life; to whom so glorious a prize is clearly presented; to whom "I am thine exceeding great reward" means far more than it could have meant to Abraham; to whom, therefore, it must be infinitely easier to rise above the sorrows of the present. It was not until long after the time of the patriarchs that the doctrine of eternal life was laid down as one of the fundamental dogmas of revelation, for reasons which we shall afterwards develop.

Faith is expressly designated in Gen. xv. 6 as the subjective

ground of the righteousness of the patriarchs before God, the soul of their religion : " And Abraham believed God, and God counted it to him for righteousness." This faith, as an absolute trust in God's word and power, notwithstanding all protests raised against it by the visible, is in essence perfectly identical with the faith of the New Testament, which accepts the word of reconciliation and the merit of Christ. The difference consists not in the position of the mind, but only in the object, in the meaning which God here and there gives to the word faith, in the expression of His power, which must be apprehended by faith. The motto of the patriarchs, like that of the New Testament believers, was : " Although the fainting heart deny, yet on Thy word I must rely." Whoever, like Abraham, in firm confidence in the word and power of God, notwithstanding his dead body and Sarah's, expects the promised son, is ready to offer up this son as a sacrifice, against the assurance of the flesh that no life can follow death, and considers the promised land his own although it is occupied by numerous and mighty nations ; who ever, like Jacob, rises above his sins, and in strong faith exclaims, " Though our sins be many," etc., is in such a position that the word of reconciliation has only to be offered, in order to be accepted by him.

§ 8.

OF THE EXTERNAL WORSHIP OF GOD AMONG THE PATRIARCHS.

The fragmentary character of the worship of the patriarchal age corresponds to the fragmentary character of its religious knowledge. To the outward signs of the worship of God belonged (1) Circumcision, of whose antiquity, origin, aim, and signification we shall speak at greater length after having first quoted the words of the divine institution from Gen. xvii. 10 *et seq.* : " This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee ; Every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And he that is eight days old shall

be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations; he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. And my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant; but the uncircumcised man-child shall be cut off from his people: he hath broken my covenant."

And here we must first answer a question which in olden times was the cause of violent disputes; the question "whether circumcision was given to Abraham by God as an entirely new custom; or whether it already existed among other nations, and passed over from them to the Israelites?" The arguments for and against may be found collected in Spencer, *de legibus Hebraeorum ritualibus*, i. 1, c. 4, sec. 2, p. 58 sqq. ed. Lips. 1705. What Michaelis says on the subject, *Mos. Recht*, Th. iv. § 185, is borrowed from him. See also Meiner's Comm. Götting. vol. xiv.; Bähr on Herodotus, ii. 37 and 104; Clericus, *ad h. l.*

There are only two nations from whom circumcision could have come to the Jews—the Egyptians and the Ethiopians—or, more correctly, but one; for in a religious point of view these two are almost equivalent to one nation, and the Israelites were in communication only with the Egyptians. Let us first collect the passages which attribute a higher antiquity to circumcision among the Egyptians than among the Hebrews. The oldest statement to this effect is to be found in Herodotus. He says, i. ii. c. 104: "It is of still greater significance (viz. for the proof of the Egyptian origin of the Colchians), that only the Colchians, Egyptians, and Ethiopians practised circumcision from the most remote times. For the Phœnicians and Syrians in Palestine (this was the name given by Herodotus and other Greeks to the Israelites, who were in reality Ibrim, Aramæans who had wandered into Palestine) themselves confess that they learnt this custom from the Egyptians. But the Syrians dwelling on the rivers Thermodon and Parthenius, and their neighbours the Macrones, say that they had only recently adopted the custom from the Colchians. These are the only nations who practise circumcision; and all appear to have done it in imitation of the Egyptians. Respecting the Egyptians and Ethiopians themselves, however, I cannot say which of the two nations learnt circumcision from the

other; for the custom is very ancient. But I am strongly convinced that other nations learnt it from the Egyptians, from the circumstance that those Phœnicians who have intercourse with the Greeks no longer imitate the Egyptians in this matter, but have given up circumcision."

Diodorus Siculus says, i. 1, c. 28: "Even the Colchians in Pontus, and the Jews between Arabia and Syria, regard some colonies as Egyptian, because their inhabitants circumcise their boys soon after birth,—an old custom which they seem to have brought with them from Egypt." In chap. 55 he says of the Colchians: "As a proof of their Egyptian origin, it has been adduced that they have circumcision like the Egyptians,—a custom which has been retained in the colonies, and which also still exists among the Jews."

The third Greek author is Strabo, who says of the Egyptians, i. 17, p. 1140, that they practise circumcision like the Jews, who, however, are originally Egyptians.

These writers are therefore of the opinion that the Israelites got circumcision from the Egyptians. But it would betray an entire want of historical criticism to prefer the accounts of foreign writers, of whom the oldest is a thousand years younger than Moses, who did not even know the language of the people of whom they speak, to the account of Moses, who does not derive circumcision from the Egyptians, but represents it as a divine appointment. We see how little their accounts are to be relied on, from the mistakes they make elsewhere. Herodotus, who never visited Judea, but only heard of the Jews through the Phœnicians (comp. Bähr on Herod. ii. 104), is mistaken in maintaining that the Jews themselves acknowledged they had received circumcision from the Egyptians. His assumption that the Phœnicians got circumcision from the Egyptians is also false; for the Phœnicians or Canaanites were not circumcised at all, as Herodotus afterwards himself confesses. Diodorus and Strabo show their ignorance by asserting that the Jews are descended from the Egyptians. But the value or worthlessness of the whole theory is best ascertained by investigating its source. It undoubtedly owes its origin to Egyptian national vanity. This is shown by the great mass of analogous inventions which appear in those accounts of Greek authors which are taken from Egyptian tradition. To

represent themselves as the original people, older than all others, from whom all other nations borrowed manners, inventions, and civilisation, was the most zealous endeavour of the Egyptians; more especially from the time when Egypt, subjugated by the Persians, had lost its whole political importance. Vanity now sought to find in the past that satisfaction which the present could no longer afford. It is almost incredible to what distortions of history it gave rise in the time that lay next to Greek history. Many examples of this have been given by Müller, *Orchomenos*, p. 1170; also in *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, f. 217 sqq., and by Creuzer in his treatise, *Ægyptii in Israelit. malevoli ac maledici*, in the *Comm. Herod.* § 21; by Welker in Jahn's *Year-Book*, ix. 3, p. 276 sqq., who recognises nothing more in the Egyptian story of Helena in Herodotus, than a transformation of matter originally Greek in the interest of national vanity. Greek credulity, and the childish wonder of the Egyptians, were calculated to provoke the Egyptian spirit of lying to such fabrications. Moreover, the three accounts may probably be reduced to one. It appears that Herodotus alone draws independently from Egyptian accounts; and that Diodorus and Strabo only copied him, as they frequently did. It cannot therefore be maintained with any appearance of probability, as Bertheau and Lengerke have done, that the Israelites adopted circumcision from the Egyptians. This is the more evident, when we see how little reliance can be placed on the other proofs which have been cited in favour of the great antiquity of circumcision among the Egyptians. Special reference is made to Josh. v. 9, where, after the completion of the circumcision which had been neglected in the wilderness, it is said that God had freed the Israelites from the reproach of Egypt. The reproach of Egypt, it is maintained, was the neglect of circumcision, with which the Egyptians had reproached the Israelites. But according to the correct explanation, the reproach of Egypt is the scorn which the Israelites suffered from the Egyptians, as well as the heathen generally, because they had been rejected by their God. The real explanation of this rejection was the neglect of circumcision,—a thing which had been commanded by God. When Israel had again been circumcised by God's command, the reproach of Egypt was taken away. For cir-

cumcision was a real assurance from God that Israel was again the covenant people. The following passages serve to illustrate this: Ex. xxxii. 12, "Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, and say, For mischief did he bring them out, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth?" Num. xiv. 13 sqq.; Deut. ix. 28. Jer. ix. 25, 26, has also been appealed to. But this passage rather furnishes a proof that, even in the comparatively late time of Jeremiah, circumcision was not universal among the Egyptians. It is there said, according to De Wette's translation: "Behold, there come days, says Jehovah, when I shall punish all the circumcised with the uncircumcised, Egypt and Judah, and Edom and the sons of Ammon, etc. For all the heathen are uncircumcised; but the whole house of Israel is uncircumcised in heart." This passage is intended to deprive the godless covenant people of that false security which was based on outward circumcision. Therefore they are to be placed in the midst of the uncircumcised. The uncircumcised in heart are to be punished no less than the uncircumcised in flesh, the heathen. By way of example, the Egyptians are also mentioned among the latter; and it is added, that all the heathen are outwardly uncircumcised; only the Israelites are outwardly circumcised. Comp. especially Venema, and more recently Graf, on this passage. The Egyptians are also placed among the uncircumcised in several passages in Ezekiel; for example, chap. xxxi. 18, xxxii. 19. To this is added that, according to other accounts, even to most recent times, circumcision among the Egyptians was peculiar to the priests. The whole nation was never circumcised. Compare the proofs in Jablonsky, *Prol.* p. 14; Wesseling on Herodotus, ii. 37. It is also stated that, in the appointment of circumcision, it is spoken of as a familiar thing. But we must not forget that Moses preserved only what was important for his time. The mode and way of circumcision were known at that time. Why then should he detail all the commands given respecting it on its first appointment? But we have an important proof of the great antiquity of circumcision among the Israelites, in the circumstance that, according to Josh. v. 2, it was done with stone knives. At the time of the first introduction of circumcision, knives of a kind which had long gone out of use in

Joshua's time must still have been employed. That which was sacred from its antiquity was retained only for a religious purpose; just as at a later period stone knives were used among the Egyptians for embalming. Yet in maintaining that circumcision originated among the race of Abraham, we do not necessarily imply that, wherever else it is found, it must have been borrowed from them. This was certainly the case with reference to the present Ethiopians, among whom circumcision prevails. Comp. Ludolph, *Hist. Æthiop.* iii. 1. Among this people it was a consequence of the great influence which, according to reliable accounts, Judaism exercised on them in the centuries antecedent to the introduction of Christianity. Among them Judaism stands parallel to the rest of the Jewish Sabbath solemnities. It is equally certain that all Mohammedan nations derived circumcision from the Israelites. With respect to the Egyptians and the ancient Ethiopians the matter is more doubtful; borrowing is even improbable in this case. The same may be said of the non-Mohammedan nations in Western and Southern Africa, who despise all that are not circumcised; comp. *Oldend.* part i. p. 297 sqq. They may readily be regarded as having been subject to Mohammedan influence, which indeed seems probable.

Neither can we allow that which has been asserted by many, viz. that circumcision among the Israelites is quite distinct from that among other nations,—because among the former it had a religious significance, among the latter only a physical aim,—and that there is therefore as little connection between them as between the habit of washing oneself and baptism. It is very questionable whether circumcision on physical grounds existed among any nation. The contrary is unquestionable with respect to the Egyptians at least. Under certain circumstances they did indeed appeal to the medicinal uses of circumcision; on which comp. Niebuhr's *Description of Arabia*, pp. 76–80. But this was only the ostensible reason, given to those who were incapable of understanding the higher. Philo even seeks to defend circumcision from physical arguments with regard to such persons. In the work *de Circumcisione* (t. ii. p. 211, ed. Mangey) he appeals to a double use of circumcision; that it prevents a most painful and troublesome disease which is very frequent, especially in hot countries, and also

that it promotes greater cleanliness of the body. That circumcision among the Egyptians had a religious aim, that it had a symbolical meaning, appears from the simple fact that only the priests were obliged to be circumcised; among whom it was so sacred a duty, that without it nobody could be initiated into the mysteries: comp. Jablonsky, p. 14. A further argument is, that the whole Egyptian ceremonial has religious significance: all interpretations which represent it as having a physical and dietetic object are proved to have been introduced at a later time, the invention of an age in which the religious element had lost its importance, and men had become incapable of understanding the power it had exercised in antiquity. But it is quite unnecessary to invent distinctions; the one which really exists is great enough. Circumcision among the Israelites is related to circumcision among other nations, not as ordinary washing perhaps, but as the religious washings of the Indians and all other nations are related to baptism. Even if all the nations of antiquity had been circumcised, and if in the case of one of them the pre-Abrahamic introduction of circumcision could be proved, that would not affect the matter. "Verbum," says Augustine, "cum accedit *elementum*, fit sacramentum." The word is the great thing, the living spirit; the external is only an addition. It is matter of perfect indifference whether the dead material, the corpse of the sacrament, is to be found anywhere else. The animating thought in Israelitish circumcision is specifically Israelitish.

This leads naturally to the inquiry respecting the aim and meaning of circumcision. Circumcision was the sign and seal of the covenant. A covenant presupposes reciprocity. Hence the sign in which the covenant is embodied must contain a double element: it must be at once an embodied promise and an embodied engagement; the respective extent of each can only be ascertained by a discussion on the meaning of the symbolical rite.

Philo, *de Circumcisione*, calls circumcision *σύμβολον ἡδονῶν ἐκτομῆς, αἱ καταγοητεύουσι διανοίαν*. In another place he says, *τὸ περιτέμνεσθαι ἡδονῶν καὶ παθῶν πάντων ἐκτομὴν καὶ δόξης ἀναίρεσιν ἀσέβους ἐμφαίνει*. But we have other more important interpretations of the meaning of circumcision,—inter-

pretations which are quite ignored by those who in recent times have set up a theory which at a glance is manifestly absurd, viz. that circumcision is a modification of that voluptuous service in which priests unmanned themselves (von Bohlen, Tuch, Baur, Lengerke). With equal right, it might be maintained that baptism is a modification of the Indian custom of drowning in the Nile. For there is nothing in favour of the view but a similarity altogether external. The difference in essence is utterly ignored. If this be considered, it will be found that there never was any transition from self-emasculation to circumcision. The circumcision of the heart is by the lawgiver himself said to be symbolized by outward circumstances, Lev. xxvi. 41, and especially Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6. To these are added the prophets; Jer. iv. 4, and chap. ix. 25, 26, where he says, "All the heathen are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israël are uncircumcised in the heart." Ezekiel goes a step further. In chap. xlv. 9, 10, he characterizes the godless priests and Levites as uncircumcised, not merely in heart, but also in flesh; because, according to the expression of the apostle, their περιτομή is become ἀκροβυστία, the sign having reality only in the presence of the *res dignata*.

It is therefore placed beyond all doubt that outward circumcision symbolized purity of heart. But, at the same time, attention is drawn to the true nature of that which is opposed to purity of heart, which ought to be removed by spiritual circumcision, and to the main thing to be considered in the reaction against sin; the reaction which proceeds from God, and the reaction which proceeds from man. Human corruption has its seat, not so much in the abuse of free will by individuals, in the power of example, etc.; but it is propagated by generation, brought into the world by birth. Circumcision presupposes the doctrine of original sin. It is a virtual acknowledgment, "I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me," Ps. li. 5; and a confession to the truth expressed in Job xiv. 4, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." To every man circumcision was a testimony to this effect: ἐν ἀμαρτίαις σὺ ἐγεννήθης ὅλος, John ix. 34. From this remark alone does it appear why this very sign should have been chosen for a designation of the thing. Circumcision generally points to sin universally; the

manner of circumcision points to the nature of sin, and designates it as having taken possession of man. But it is evident from the passages already quoted, that original sin has its proper seat not in the body, but in the heart: it is clear that what happens to the body only prefigures what ought to happen to the heart; which cuts away the root from the physical theory of v. Hofmann (p. 100). The manner of circumcision points not to the seat but to the origin of sin.

It now becomes easy to define more exactly the twofold element embodied in circumcision, viz. that of the promise and that of the engagement. It is the more easy, because the law-giver himself clearly gives prominence to both; the former in Deut. xxx. 6, "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live;" the latter in the exhortation based on the promise, chap. x. 16.

1. So far as circumcision was an embodied promise, it formed the comforting assurance that God would freely bestow that which it symbolized on the whole nation, and on those individuals who had participated in the rite by His command. Whoever bore the mark of circumcision might have perfect confidence that God would not leave him without the help of His grace, but would give him power to circumcise his heart, and to eradicate the sin he had inherited. In so far as the means by which sin could be met in an internal effectual way did not exist in full power under the Old Testament, circumcision pointed beyond the old dispensation to the new, under which the most efficacious principle for the extermination of sin was to be given in the *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*. Circumcision was an indirect Messianic prophecy. In the main, therefore, it guaranteed the fundamental benefit of the kingdom of God—renovation of the heart, regeneration. But circumcision was at the same time a pledge of participation in all the outward blessings of God. Both are closely connected. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you," is perfectly applicable here. In the kingdom of God there were no outward blessings. The blessing was in every case only the reflection of faithfulness towards God. But it was also its necessary attendant. Hence that which was a pledge of the help of

divine grace in the alteration of the heart, must also necessarily be a pledge of the communication of external divine favours. Whoever therefore received circumcision, was adopted by this means into the sphere of divine privileges in every respect.

2. So far as circumcision was an embodied engagement, it contained the voluntary declaration that a man would circumcise his heart; that, rooting out all sinful desires, he would love God with his whole heart, and obey Him alone.

From this second meaning of circumcision, it follows, as St. Paul says, that circumcision is of use if a man keep the law; if not, that circumcision becomes uncircumcision. And as those who do not fulfil the conditions of the covenant have no part in its verbal promises, so also are they excluded from participation in the embodied promise which, in another aspect, is an embodied engagement. The necessary consequence of this, St. Paul says, Gal. v. 3, is that every one who is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole law. The circumcision given to Israel was a solemn declaration that a man would circumcise his heart, and that, denying his own inclinations, he would serve God alone. Whoever made this declaration in the form prescribed under the Old Testament dispensation, thus declared himself a member of that covenant, and ready to seek after righteousness in the Old Testament form: the transgression of the least of the Old Testament commandments then became a violation of his engagement. Circumcision is related to the mere promise of purity of heart, as the Mosaic law to the divine law generally. Both meanings of circumcision lie close to one another, and are not unconnected; or rather, the second follows from the first. Just as every gift of God at the same time imposes an obligation, so the necessary sequence of "I will purify thee," is, "I will purify myself." Whoever has declared the contrary to "I will purify myself," is either outwardly deprived of circumcision, as in the march through the wilderness, or at least it ceases to be circumcision for him.

All the foregoing representation explains the reason why, on the appointment of circumcision, the neglect of it was designated as so great a crime, that whoever was guilty of it was expelled *eo ipso* from the community of God, as one who had made His covenant of none effect. Circumcision was the

embodied covenant. Whoever despised the former, made a virtual declaration that he would have no part in the promises of the latter; would not fulfil its conditions—viz. that he had no desire that God should purify his heart, and would not himself strive after purity.

We have still to speak of the relation of circumcision to the passover. But it will be better to do so after we have explained the nature of the passover.

A second outward sign of the worship of God consisted in sacrifice. The presentation of sacrifices was not yet confined to any one place. According to the accounts of the ancients, Egypt was the land where temples were first erected to the gods (Herod. ii. 4; Lucian, *de Dea Syria*, ii. p. 657 opp.), and that very probably as early as the time of the patriarchs. For we find even in Joseph's time a developed priestly condition in Egypt. The patriarchs built an altar to Jehovah in every place where they resided for any length of time, in groves or on mountains; of stones, or of green turf, under the open heavens. Under certain circumstances, they even split the wood themselves for the burning of the sacrifice, slaughtered it with a sacrificial knife, and then burnt it whole. In sacrifice they used the same animals which Moses afterwards commanded, viz. sheep, rams, and cows, but not goats, which in the Mosaic time were appointed as sin-offerings—a thing which does not yet appear in the patriarchal time. This similarity of sacrificial animals is due to the fact that the Mosaic commands in this respect rest not so much on caprice as upon a certain natural fitness, or a perception of their symbolical character, which must have been prevalent before the legal determination. The sacrifice of the pig or the dog is inconceivable, except among nations in whom the sense of natural symbolism is wholly corrupted. To offer up other than domestic animals did not belong to the idea of sacrifice. Sacrifice has throughout a vicarious signification. In sacrifice a man offers up himself; and therefore, according to the expression of De Maistre, the most human sacrifices must be chosen, viz. those animals which stand in the closest relation to man. Prayer was constantly combined with sacrifice, and is often mentioned by itself in the history of the patriarchs; for example, in Gen. xxiv. 63, xx. 7, xxxii. 9. Wherever the erection of an altar is mentioned,

reference is also made to invocation of God. Quite naturally, for sacrifice is only an embodied expression of prayer. Prayer is its embodiment. We learn the closeness of the connection between sacrifice and prayer from passages like Hos. xiv. 2: "Receive us graciously; so will we render the calves of our lips." Thanksgiving here appears as the soul of thankoffering. The embodiment of prayer in sacrifice was in harmony with the symbolic spirit of antiquity, with the necessity of beholding outwardly that which moves the heart inwardly,—a want which dwells so deeply in man in times of the predominance of sensuous views and imagination. But we must not dwell upon this. Along with the impulse towards outward representation, another tendency is operative in sacrifice, viz. to attest the truth and reality of internal feeling, and so to avoid the possibility of self-deception. It is essential to sacrifice, that man offer up a part of his possessions. In every great section of their lives, after every great divine preservation and blessing, the patriarchs instituted a peculiarly solemn public act of worship: for example, Abraham, after his arrival in Canaan, and the first manifestations of God given to him there, and again after his return from Egypt, etc. The קָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה, which is generally used in Genesis in speaking of such a solemn act of worship—for example, in chap. xii. 8—means to call on the name of the Lord, not to preach of the name of the Lord, as Luther has translated it. The name of the Lord is mentioned, because all invocation of God has reference, not to the mere *summum numen*, but to the God who has revealed Himself in His works. The name of God is everywhere in Scripture the product and combination of His deeds. But Luther's translation is not incorrect in essence. Abraham's public solemn invocation of God, and his thanksgiving for those actions which had made him famous, were at the same time a preaching of the name of the Lord.

It is not purely accidental that in the patriarchal time there existed no special priestly condition—just as little accidental as the appointment of such a condition in the Mosaic time. It stands in the closest connection with the simplicity and formlessness of the patriarchal religion. In ancient times there were warm disputes as to who possessed the right of offering sacrifices under the patriarchal constitution. Hebrew scholars

unanimously conceded this right to the first-born, as Onkelos had previously done in Gen. xlix. 3; Luther founded a proof for the priesthood of the first-born on an incorrect translation of the same passage; and many theologians followed their footsteps. Spencer has combated this opinion with the greatest thoroughness: *de legibus Hebr. ritualibus*, i. c. 6, sec. 2, p. 208 sqq. Yet it may be maintained with a certain modification, namely, just as in every family the father exercised supreme authority, so he also possessed the right to sacrifice, as appears from the examples of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. And if the father of the family died, the first-born became head, and received also the right to sacrifice. But just as the power of the first-born over the younger brethren lasted only so long as they remained in the same family, so the right to sacrifice passed over to them as soon as they themselves founded a family. The first-born had therefore the right to sacrifice, not as such, but as the head of a family. It may therefore be said that the right to sacrifice was associated with the right to command. Whoever had a right to command those beneath him, had also the right and the obligation to supplicate the power which was superior to him. He was the natural representative before God of those over whom he had charge, and so far he was the priest appointed by God Himself. But this right, pertaining to the head of the house, to present sacrifices and prayers for his family and for himself, was distinct from the public priesthood which Melchizedek exercised, and concerning which we have said all that is necessary in the history of Melchizedek. The origin of sacrifice has been much disputed. One party maintained that it was originally a divine institution, while others advocated a natural origin. Of the former view there is not the least trace to be found in Genesis. It probably originated in incapacity to transport oneself to old times. Otherwise it must have been seen that sacrifice and prayer stood on the same level. Sacrifice, on the subjective side, which is the only aspect apparent in Genesis (the objection first appears in the Mosaic economy), is an embodiment of prayer; and in the tendency of the old world to symbolism, having its basis on the prevalence of intuition, this embodiment must necessarily take form of itself, as it did among different nations independently. Here the divine ele-

ment is prayer. This is a living testimony of the union of God with the human race, perpetuated even after the fall. But we must not regard prayer as an outward demonstration. It is a natural and necessary efflux of religious consciousness. Religious consciousness, however, only exists where God reveals Himself to the heart.

From this relation of sacrifice to religious consciousness, it appears that the offering of sacrifice is not in itself the sign of a lower religious standpoint. It only becomes such when religious consciousness and prayer, the soul of sacrifice, have become impure and degenerate. Here also the original seat of sin is not in the body. Sacrifices outwardly alike are separated as widely as possible by the different intention with which they are offered. Yet the danger of the *opus operatum* lies close at hand, as in all embodiments of religious feelings. Abraham is already directed to this by the command to offer up his son. By such means he is distinctly told that God does not desire cows and sheep, but in cows and sheep demands the heart. Every sacrifice of an animal must also be a human sacrifice. The patriarchs had a lesson concerning the nature of sacrifice in the history of Abel and Cain, which has passed on to us by their means. According to Gen. iv. 2, 3, notwithstanding the outward similarity of the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, their acceptance with God is different; and this difference is traced back to the difference of personalities. Hence it becomes evident to all who have any desire to see the truth, that sacrifice has significance only as a reflection of inner states. Whoever therefore presents an offering as a mere *opus operatum*, takes the rejected Cain for his father; for Cain's sacrifice typifies the sacrifices of the heathen generally; while the offering of Abel forms the type of the offering of the faithful of the Old Testament. Heathen sacrifices are a subterfuge, a substitute for the heart which the offerer has neither power nor wish to bring. On the other hand, in the biblical sphere, the sacrifice of animals bears a patent character: in the form of an animal, man himself is offered up. Three kinds of sacrifice are prescribed by the law: sin-offering; burnt or whole offering, which expresses the consecration of the whole person to God in all the particulars of existence; and *schelamim*, atonement-offering, which in thanksgiving and prayer had salvation for their

object. Of these three the patriarchal age knows only two, viz. burnt-offering and atonement-offering. We have already pointed out the reason of this. It lies in the childlike character of the patriarchal time. Consciousness of sin was not yet developed. Sin-offerings were still included in burnt-offerings. Even in the Mosaic time the latter retained a reference to the consciousness of guilt; for if, in presenting them, the whole man consecrated himself to God, sin could not be left quite out of consideration. In them a man besought forgiveness for his sins as the principal hindrance to consecration, and his request was granted; all burnt-offerings served at the same time as an atonement for souls. But the consciousness of sin had now become so powerful, that it required a peculiar representation besides.

3. The celebration of the Sabbath is generally reckoned as part of the outward worship of God. Michaelis, after the example of other theologians, has strenuously endeavoured to prove that it was observed in the patriarchal age: *Mos. Recht*, iv. § 195; also Liebetrut, *The Day of the Lord*; and Oschwald in his prize-essay on the celebration of the Sabbath. But there is not a single tenable argument to be adduced in favour of the pre-Mosaic existence of the Sabbath. That it was instituted immediately after the creation cannot be maintained, for nothing is then said of a command. It is true that God hallows the seventh day and blesses it; but the realization of this would presuppose circumstances which were present only in the Mosaic economy. The Sabbath could not have been destined to come into operation except in connection with a whole divine institution. It is false to assert that the division into weeks, which we find in the very earliest times, can be explained only by the existence of the Sabbath. The week is a subdivision of the month into quarters of the moon; comp. Ideler, *Chronologie*, Th. i. 60. It is equally vain to appeal to the hallowing of the seventh day among the most diverse peoples of the earth. On nearer examination of the proofs brought forward for the celebration of the Sabbath, it is evident that the seventh day was kept by no other nation besides the Israelites. The command, "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy," would only prove that the Sabbath was at that time already known among Israel, if it were not followed by

an accurate statement respecting what was to be understood by the Sabbath. On the other hand, we must remember that in the whole pre-Mosaic history no trace at all is to be found of the celebration of the Sabbath; that, according to Ex. xvi. 22-30, God hallows the Sabbath as a completely new institution, by the cessation of the manna on that day, before the command to keep it holy had been given to the Israelites; and that the Sabbath is everywhere represented as a special privilege bestowed by God upon Israel, as a sign of the covenant and a pledge of their election: comp. Ex. xxxi. 13-17; Ezek. xx. 12; Neh. ix. 14.

4. The offering of tithes belonged to the external worship of God. That these, if not prevailing before the Mosaic time, did at least exist, is evident not merely from the circumstance that Jacob made a vow to give them to God, Gen. xxviii. 22; but also because Moses, in his regulations respecting the second tithes, speaks of them as already customary before his time. No properly comprehensive law respecting these tithes is to be found in the Pentateuch. In Deut. xii. they are mentioned only with reference to the place where they are to be consumed; and in chap. xiv. 22 only a secondary precept is given respecting them. Clearly, therefore, they were not established by Moses, but only recognised. A man did not give them to another, but consumed them himself at sacrificial meals, to which he invited widows, orphans, strangers, the poor, and his own servants, and thus gave them a joyous day. It was thought that God could be best honoured by bestowing benefits on His creatures; the sacrificial meals were at the same time love-feasts: comp. Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, iv. § 192. What had originally been a voluntary act of love to individuals, had by degrees become an established custom. In this matter the example of the ancestor doubtless exercised great influence. We find a pre-indication of the later Levitical tithes in those given by Abraham to Melchizedek.

5. The anointing and consecration of stones are regarded by many as having been an outward religious custom. But the circumstance that Jacob consecrated a stone does not justify the assumption that this was a usual form of worship. Rather does the narrative itself show that it here treats of something exceptional. The stone is consecrated by Jacob not as such,

but as representative of an altar to be erected there at a future time, so that the latter was consecrated in the former.

6. Purifications belong to the number of religious usages (purifications before the offering of sacrifice; connected with the putting on of clean garments, which in Gen. xxxv. 2 is said to have been done by Jacob and his whole family before going to Bethel). At the basis of this rite of purification lies the feeling that he who wishes to approach God must do so with the deepest reverence. "Be ye holy, for I am holy," enters most powerfully into the consciousness in approaching the Holy One; comp. Isa. vi. If this reverence is exemplified even in outward things, how much more ought it to be evident in the direction of the heart! The delusion that it is enough to be externally reverent is far removed from the religious standpoint of the patriarchs; but this standpoint necessarily demands that the internal be expressed through the medium of the external.

7. Imposition of hands, first mentioned in Gen. xlviii. 13, 14, was another external religious custom, symbolizing the granting of divine grace. The hand serves as it were for a ladder. The practice presupposes that the laying on of hands stands in close relation to God, and may therefore be the medium of His grace. Traces of such a mediation also occur apart from its embodiment in this custom. Abimelech is told in a dream: "Abraham is a prophet; let him pray for thee, and thou shalt live," Gen. xx. Again, in Abraham's intercession for Sodom and Gomorrha, and the sparing of Lot for his sake; and in the blessing which Melchizedek pronounces on Abraham, by virtue of his office as priest of the most high God. This custom was afterwards very general among the Israelites. The laying on of hands was practised not only in investing with an office (comp. Num. xxvii. 18, Deut. xxxiv. 9, and other passages), but children were also brought to those who had the character of peculiar holiness and sanctity before God, that they might be blessed by the laying on of hands; comp. Matt. xix. 13. The hand was laid on also in imparting the Holy Ghost, and in healing. "The meaning of the rite," Kurtz strikingly remarks, "is quite obvious in all these cases. Its object is, the communication of something which the one has, and the other lacks or is to receive. The object of the com-

munication is determined by the individual case, blessing, health, the Holy Spirit. The hand of the one is really or symbolically the medium of the communication, the head of the other is the receptive part."

We find burial ceremonies observed in the history of the patriarchs only in the case of Jacob and Joseph, and that after the Egyptian fashion. Their corpses were embalmed by Egyptians; an Egyptian custom which is copiously described by Herodotus, l. ii. c. 85 *sqq.*, and by Diodorus Siculus, i. 1, p. 81 *sqq.* On Jacob's death a public mourning was held in Egypt, and the most distinguished Egyptians accompanied his body in solemn procession to Canaan.

SECOND PERIOD.

THE PERIOD OF THE LAW, FROM MOSES TO THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

FIRST SECTION.

MOSES.

The only source is the Pentateuch, for we have already shown that all else which has been represented as such is undeserving of the name.

§ 1.

INTRODUCTION.



MOSES interrupts his narrative where the divine revelations ceased for a time. Of the condition of the nation, which was now for a time left to its own development, he relates only so much as is necessary for the understanding of what follows, and takes up the narrative again where the divine revelations begin anew. We shall here give a brief summary of the accounts which we possess of the condition of the Israelites in Egypt before the time of Moses.

1. *In reference to their External and Civil Relations.*

Respecting the dwelling-place of the Israelities, comp. *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, p. 40 *et seq.*

After the death of Israel and Joseph the descendants of Abraham rapidly grew to be a numerous nation. Their increase, comparatively so great, is in Ex. i. 12 represented as the result of special divine blessing, which does not, however, preclude the possibility of this gracious power of God having worked through the natural means present in Egypt. In the most fruitful of all countries, it was quite easy for each one to pro-

cure the necessary means of substance for himself and his family. According to Diod. Sic. i. 80, the maintenance of a child cost only twenty drachmæ=thirteen shillings. Early marriages were therefore customary. Add to this the unusually rapid increase of population in Egypt. Aristotle, in his *Hist. Anim.* vii. 4, 5, relates that the women in Egypt not only brought forth twins at one birth, but not seldom three and four, sometimes even five. Indeed, he tells of one woman who in four births brought twenty children into the world. Pliny, in his *Hist. Nat.* vii. 3, gives still more exaggerated accounts. But this exaggeration must have a basis of truth, as our knowledge of modern Egypt attests: comp. Jomard, in the *Description*, ix. 130 *et seq.* In the objections which have been raised against the acceptance of so rapid an increase of the Israelites, it has been too much overlooked that the increase of nations is widely different, and depends altogether upon circumstances. Thus, for example, in South Africa ten children may be reckoned to every marriage among the colonists: Lichtenstein, *Travels in S. Africa*, i. p. 180. The increase of population is also very rapid in North America. Then, again, many proceed on the unfounded assumption that the residence of the Israelites in Egypt lasted only 215 years instead of 430; and finally, it has been left out of consideration that to the seventy souls of Jacob's family we must add the number of servants, by no means inconsiderable, who by circumcision were received into the chosen race, in order *à priori* to preclude the thought that participation in salvation was necessarily associated with carnal birth.

With respect to the constitution of the Israelites during their residence in Egypt, they were divided into tribes and families. Every tribe had its prince—a regulation which dates beyond the Mosaic time; for we nowhere read that it was made by Moses, and indeed it is at variance with his whole administration: comp. Num. ii. 29. The heads of the greater families or tribes, the *משפחות* or *בתי אבות* (the former is the proper *termin. tech.*; on the other hand, the latter appears also of the individual family, and of the whole race: comp. Ex. xii. 3; Num. iii. 15, 20), were called heads of the houses of the fathers, or simply heads. They appear also under the name of elders, or *זקנים*, which is not a designation of age, but of dignity: comp. Ex. iv.

29, according to which Moses and Aaron begin their work by collecting the elders of the people. Kurtz (*Gesch. des A. T.* ii. § 8) is quite wrong in maintaining that the elders of the tribes and the heads of the families were distinct. In Deut. xxix. 10, to which he appeals, "your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers," the magistracy and the people are first of all contrasted; then the two classes of magistrates, the natural rulers or elders, and the scribes, a sort of mixture of the patriarchal constitution,—jurists, who in Egypt, where the condition of the people had assumed a more complex character, had come to be associated with the natural rulers. We find the same constitution among the Edomites, the Ishmaelites, and the present Bedouins, among the ancient Germans, and the Scotch: comp. Michaelis, *Mos. R.* i. § 46. These rulers were also the natural judges of the people. Yet in the times of the Egyptian oppression only a shadow remained of their judicial power. We have already pointed out the error of the common assumption that the Israelites continued a nomadic life in Egypt (comp. the copious refutation in the *Beitr.* ii. S. 431 *et seq.*). The foundation of the settled life was laid in the very first settlement. It was in the best and most fruitful part of the land that the Israelites received their residence, at least in part: Gen. xlvii. 11, 27. The land of Goshen, the eastern portion of Lower Egypt, forms the transition from the garden-land of the Nile to the pasturage of the desert. It is inconceivable that they should not have taken advantage of the excellent opportunity for agriculture which presented itself; and to participation in Egyptian agriculture was added participation in Egyptian civilisation. It is expressly stated in Deut. xi. 10, that a great number of the Israelites devoted themselves to agriculture in Egypt, dwelling on the fruitful banks of the Nile and its tributaries. We learn from Num. xi. 5, xx. 5, how completely they shared the advantages which the Nile afforded to Egypt. To this may be added passages such as Ex. iii. 20–22, xi. 1–3, according to which the Israelites dwelt in houses, and in some cases had rich Egyptians in hire: again, the circumstance that Moses founds the state on agriculture, without giving any intimation that the nation had first to pass over to this new mode of life; the skill of the Israelites, as it appears especially in the accounts of the tabernacle; the wide spread of the art of

writing among the Israelites in the time of Moses, which we gather from the scattered statements of the Pentateuch, while in the patriarchal time there was no thought of such a thing, etc. On the other hand, the assumption of a continued nomadic life appears on nearer proof to be mere baseless prejudice. If this assumption were correct, the divine intention in the transplanting of the Israelites to Egypt would be very much obscured, so that the establishment of the right view has at the same time a *theological* interest.

For a long period Israel remained unmolested by the Egyptians. This is implied in the statement that the oppression originated with a king who knew not Joseph, and therefore ensued at a time when the remembrance of him and his beneficent acts had already passed away. Then, again, in the statement of the motives of the Egyptians, which had their root in the circumstance that Israel had already become a great and powerful nation. Without doubt, the oppression began in the century previous to the appearing of Moses. Attempts have been made to explain that which is related of the oppression of the Israelites by the king who knew not Joseph, from a statement of Manetho, who states in Josephus, *c. Apion*, i. 14–16, that under the reign of King Timæus, a strange people, named Hyksos, invaded Egypt from the eastern region, practised great cruelties and destruction there, subjected a great portion of the country, and made Salatis, one of their own people, king. After they had retained possession of the land for 511 years, they were finally conquered by the inhabitants. Despairing of their complete extinction, the conqueror concluded an agreement with them, and gave free exit. Hence 240,000 of them left Egypt, with their families and their possessions, repairing through the wilderness to Syria, and in the country which is now called Judea founded a town large enough to contain so great a number of men. This they called Jerusalem. Many scholars have therefore concluded that this is the dynasty which knew not the merits of Joseph, and oppressed the Israelites. They imagined that this happened in order to prevent the union of the Israelites with the inhabitants of the land, who only awaited an opportunity to throw off the yoke which was a burden to them. Thus recently Saalschütz, *Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der hebr. ägypt. Archäologie*,

Königsberg 1851; iii. *die Maneth. Hyksos*, § 41 ff. Others—lastly Kurtz, *Gesch. des A. B.* ii. S. 197—assert that these shepherd-kings were already in possession of the land when Joseph and his family immigrated. Afterwards the old Pharaoh-race again came to the throne, and, not without reason, suspicious of all shepherd-nations, caused the Israelites to feel their suspicion and severity. But against this are the facts, that already in Joseph's time the Egyptians ate with no foreigner, Gen. xliii. 32; that shepherds were an abomination to the ruling race; that Joseph was obliged to free himself from the ignominy of his origin by marriage with the daughter of a high priest; and that the king bore the unmistakeably Egyptian title of Pharaoh. All this shows that the immigration of the Israelites took place under a national Egyptian dynasty. Other hypotheses still more intricate we pass by. There is no necessity for them. On impartial consideration, it soon appears that the Hyksos of Manetho are the Israelites themselves, and that his statements respecting them do not by any means rest upon independent Egyptian tradition, but are a mere perversion and distortion of the accounts in the Pentateuch, undertaken in the service of Egyptian national vanity,—accounts which came into circulation in Egypt during the residence of the Jews there after the time of Alexander. Hence the history of the Israelites can gain nothing from these statements of Manetho. Among the ancients, after the example of Josephus, Perizonius and Baumgarten have already shown this; but Thorlacius has given the most complete argument, *de Hycsorum Abari*, Copenhagen 1794: comp. also Jablonsky, *Opuscc.* i. p. 356 ff.; and the treatise, *Manetho und die Hyksos als Beilage der Schrift. die B.B. Moses u. Ägypten*; also the researches of v. Hofmann (*Stud. und Krit.* 1839, ii. p. 393 ff.), Delitzsch (*Commentar über die Genes.* iii. Ausl. S. 518 ff.), and Uhlemann in the work *Israeliten und die Hyksos in Ägypten vom Jahr.* 1856. Although Bertheau, Ewald, Lengerke, Kurtz, and others, with remarkable lack of critical insight, employ Manetho as if they had the best contemporary sources before them, it may be seen how bad an authority he is for events which occurred in the Mosaic time, from the gross errors of which he is shown to be guilty, in the work *Egypt and the Books of Moses*,—errors of such a kind

that it is impossible not to regard his statement that he has written as a distinguished priest under Ptolemy Philadelphus as false, and to assume that his work belongs to the time of all those other Egyptian narrations which are hostile to the Israelites, and have been preserved in fragments in Josephus, viz. the beginning of the Roman Empire.

Again, notwithstanding all misrepresentations undertaken in the Egyptian interest (the object was to retort upon the Israelites that shame which accrued to the Egyptians from the accounts of the Israelitish historical books, to throw back the reproach of barbarity and inhumanity upon those with whom it had originated), yet the dependence of the relation on the Mosaic narrative clearly appears. The Hyksos, like the Israelites, come to Egypt from the region *πρὸς ἀνατολήν*; they are shepherds, comp. Gen. xlv. 34; *ῥαδίως, ἀμαχητὶ*, they occupy Egypt,—a perversion of what is told in Genesis concerning the measures of Joseph. The name of their first king, Salatis, a sufficient argument of itself against Rosellini, who makes the Hyksos Scythians, has evidently arisen from Gen. xlii. 6, where Joseph is called *יִשְׁשַׁכ*. (In Eusebius this name is corrupted into Saïtes, after an Egyptian reminiscence.) To this first king the measuring of corn is attributed as one of his principal occupations, *σιτομετρέειν*, which has no other meaning than to provide food, and not that which Kurtz has attributed to it in his *Gesch. des A. B.* ii. S. 187. The position of Avarison completely agrees with that of Gosen. The name is evidently imitated from that of the Hebrews. The Hyksos repair to Palestine, and Jerusalem becomes their chief city.

Finally, Manetho himself has asserted that by the Hyksos are to be understood the Israelites. The contrary is generally concluded from another statement of Manetho, in Josephus, *c. Apion*, i. 26, where the Israelites appear as born Egyptians who have been driven out on account of leprosy. But there is nothing to prevent both accounts having reference to the Jews. Manetho's view clearly is, that the Jews are a mixture of two elements, a barbaric (with respect to whose origin he is uncertain, probably Arabian) and an Egyptian, as we are told in the Pentateuch itself that on the exodus of the Israelites they were joined by a great number of Egyptians. The Hyksos, after their first expulsion, betake themselves to

Palestine. (This clearly proves that to Manetho they are identical with the Israelites, and at the same time nullifies the argument on the other side.) Here they build Jerusalem, and hither they return after the second expulsion with the unclean.

They are pursued by Amenophis as far as the borders of Syria; Josephus, i. c. i. 27. In Chaeremon also we find the same double origin of the Jews. That Manetho denied the identity of the Jews and the Hyksos, seems never to have occurred to Josephus. Everywhere he presupposes the contrary, making no attempt to prove it.

Further, we only remark, that more recent and really solid Egyptian researches have not discovered the smallest trace of a supremacy of the Hyksos in Egypt, as is said to have taken place in accordance with the customary opinion. Among others Uhlemann has shown this; and even Renan in an essay on Egyptian antiquity in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of the year 1865 is obliged to confess it, and seeks to help himself by the far-fetched assumption that the native kings removed every trace of the hated Hyksos. As in Scripture the supremacy of the native Egyptian kings appears to have been uninterrupted, Abraham, Joseph, and Moses having to do with a Pharaoh, which is everywhere the name of native Egyptian kings; so also on the monuments. Herodotus, and in general all authors of ancient times, know nothing of the Hyksos.

The words of the record, "There arose a new king in Egypt who knew not Joseph," can in no wise be regarded as the beginning of the Hyksos-fable. The antithesis of the old and the new king may very appropriately lie in this, that the first king knew Joseph, the second refused to know anything of him,—a distinction of universally prevailing significance for Israel, from whose standpoint the account is written, and one which formed the beginning of a new era. But, at all events, the words do not indicate more than a change of the native dynasty, which demonstrably took place not unfrequently in Egypt. Josephus, indeed, refers to such a one, *Antiq.* ii. 9. 1: *τῆς βασιλείας εἰς ἄλλον οἶκον μετεληλυθίας.*

We may be fully satisfied with the motives given by the king of Egypt himself, Ex. i. 9 *et seq.*, as an explanation of the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt. The Israelites had grown to be

a numerous nation. They had carefully asserted their national independence; and on both sides there were insurmountable barriers against every attempt to unite them with the Egyptians. This *status in statu* inspired the Egyptian kings with increasing apprehension, which more than outweighed the remembrance of all that Joseph had done for the land. It is true that the Egyptian kingdom was so mighty that it had nothing to fear from the Israelites alone. But circumstances might arise, where, in alliance with other nations, Israel might become a terror to them, comp. Ex. i. 10; and the thought of this lay the nearer, since Egypt was surrounded on all sides by natural enemies, by nomadic tribes whose eye was ever directed towards the fruitful valley of the Nile. At best, it was to be feared that the Israelites, availing themselves of the opportunity, would depart, and that not empty, but laden with the spoil of Egypt. This seemed the more probable, since it was known that the Israelites themselves looked upon Egypt only as a land of pilgrimage, and that the whole nation was animated by a lively hope of returning at some future time to Canaan, which they regarded as their proper fatherland. Had the voice of justice been listened to, if it seemed dangerous to suffer the Israelites to remain any longer in the country in their former independence, free exodus would have been given to them with all their possessions. The Egyptians had no claim upon them; they had been called into the country on condition of retaining their independence; and if this could and would no longer be conceded to them, they should have been allowed to depart. But because the foundation of right feeling, religion, had at that time almost disappeared from Egypt, and because human images, partial national gods, had been substituted for the holy and righteous God, and men deemed they were doing service to these deities by practising injustice on a people not belonging to them (in no land of the world are the gods so decisively a product of national egotism as in Egypt), therefore no voice was listened to but that of self-interest; and so it appeared most unwise voluntarily to relinquish such great possession and so many hands. The Egyptians were notorious throughout antiquity for their severity towards foreigners. Already Homer says that they regarded all strangers as enemies, and either killed them or forced them to compulsory

service: *σφίσιν ἐργάζεσθαι ἀνάγκη*, *Od.* 14, v. 272, 17, 410. According to Herodotus (2, 108) and Diodorus, the Egyptians considered it a matter of pride to employ no natives, but only prisoners and slaves, in the building of their monuments. It was resolved to convert Israel into a nation of slaves, and with this object means were chosen which must have been eminently successful if there had been no God in heaven (but the neglect of this, as the result shows, was a very great mistake in the reckoning). The Israelites were driven to compulsory service, of whose magnitude and difficulty we may form some idea from those monuments which still exist as an object of wonder; but particularly from a monument discovered in Thebes, representing the Hebrews preparing bricks, of which Rosellini was the first to give a copy and description, ii. 2, S. 254 *et seq.*: compare the copious remarks on this interesting picture in *B.B. Moses*, etc., S. 79 ff.; Wilkinson, 2, 98 ff. *Against* its reference to the Jews Wilkinson has raised a double objection. (1.) It is incomprehensible how a representation of the labours of the *Israelites* should come to be on a tombstone in *Thebes*. But it might just as readily have happened that parties of them were sent to Thebes to compulsory service, as that the Israelites should have been scattered abroad throughout all Egypt to gather straw, *Ex.* v. 12. Even now in Egypt, the poor Fellahs are driven like flocks out of the land when any great work is required. (2.) The workers want the beard which forms so characteristic a mark of the prisoners from Syria, and especially of those of Sesonk. But this argument is refuted by what Wilkinson himself says in another place: "Although strangers who were brought as slaves to Egypt had beards on their arrival in the land, yet we find that, as soon as they were employed in the service of this civilised nation, they were obliged to adopt the cleanly habits of their masters, their beards and heads were shaved, and they received a narrow hat." That which tells most in favour of this reference to the Jews, is that the physiognomies have an expression so characteristically Jewish, that every one must recognise them as Jews at the first glance. The clear colour of their skin already suggests the idea of captive Asiatics.

It was hoped that a great number of the Israelites would sink under the heavy work, and that the remaining masses

would acquire a low, slavish spirit. And when it became evident that this measure had not attained its object,—that the concealed divine blessing accompanying the visible cross called forth a continued growth of the nation,—measures still more cruel were resorted to, which trampled under foot all divine and human rights, and failed to lead to a successful result just because of their exaggerated cruelty. The matter was thus brought to a climax. The existence of the nation was at stake, and at the same time God's faithfulness and truth. To faith this misery was a prophecy of salvation. It was not in vain that believers so often cried out in the Psalms: "Save me, O God, for I am in misery," or "I cry unto Thee." Election being presupposed, every misfortune contains a promise of deliverance. This is the main distinction between the sufferings of the world and the sufferings of God's people. The cross of the latter is an actual appeal: "Lift up your heads, for ye see that your salvation draweth nigh." The greater the cross, the greater and nearer is the deliverance.

But Israel was enabled to come to this conclusion not merely from the fact of their having been chosen. God had already given them special comfort in this respect, having applied the idea individually. It had already been told to Abraham that his posterity should be strangers in a foreign land. The appointed time had expired, or was near its expiration; the severe oppression which had been foretold had come to pass; and therefore the salvation so closely connected with it must also be at hand,—deliverance from the land of the oppressors by means of great judgments; the march to Canaan with great possessions. It must come to pass, or God would not be God, Jehovah, the one, the unchangeable.

2. *Respecting the Religious and Moral Condition of the Israelites in Egypt before Moses.*

On this subject a violent dispute has been carried on among ancient theologians. Spencer, *de legibus Hebraeorum ritualibus*, i. 1, cap. 1, sec. 1, p. 20 sqq., maintains that the Israelites in Egypt had almost lost the knowledge of the true God, and had given themselves up to the idolatry of the Egyptians. On this he based the opinion, to carry out which is the aim of his whole work, that the ceremonial law has not an absolute

but only a relative value; that God permitted those heathen customs to which the Israelites had accustomed themselves to remain just as they were, so far as they were not directly associated with the worship of idols, so far as they were *ineptiae tolerabiles*, to use his own expression, thus to leave the nation its plaything, lest, by having all taken from it, it might be induced to retain everything, even idolatry. From this opinion there is only one step to the acceptance of a purely human origin of the Mosaic law; and many theologians to whom it was justly offensive, regarding it as an *ineptia intolerabilis*, sought to undermine the foundation of it, and to show that the Israelites remained faithful to the true religion. Salomo Deyling, in his *Oratio de Israelitarum Ægyptiacorum ingenio*, at the end of vol. i. of the *Observatt. Sacrae*, goes farthest in this view.

It is clear that both parties have gone too far, occupied by preconceived opinions. On one side it is certain that the knowledge of the true God and His honour was not yet lost among the Israelites. Otherwise how could Moses, who came as the ambassador of this God,—comp. Ex. iii. 15, “Jehovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you;” chap. vi. 3,—have found a hearing? They were still familiar with the promises of the land of Canaan. Moses found them still in possession of the traditions of the life of the patriarchs, and their relation to the Lord. We have a memorial of continued union with the Lord in the names of that time, which contain the expression of a true knowledge of God. It is remarkable, however, that among these names there are very few which are compounded with Jehovah, such as Jochebed, while there are many with אל; for example, the three names ’Uzziel, Mishaël, ’Elzaphan, in Ex. vi. 22. Already Simonis remarks: *Compositio cum יהוה maxime obtinuit temporibus regum*. From fear of God, the Hebrew midwives transgressed the royal mandate at their own peril. “The fault is in thine own people,” were the words of the oppressed Israelites to Pharaoh in chap. v. 16; “by the injustice which thou doest unto us they incur heavy sin; and where sin is, punishment soon follows.” By this expression they show that they had not yet lost the consciousness of a holy and just God. The con-

tinuance of circumcision in Egypt is proved by the words of Ex. iv. 24-26, and by Josh. v. 5, according to which all the Israelites were circumcised on their departure from Egypt.

On the other side, it cannot be denied that those who persist in representing Israel as quite pure, are at direct variance with the most explicit testimony of Scripture. We see how much the Israelites had succumbed to Egyptian influence by their great effeminacy, which is denied by Ewald, notwithstanding the decided testimony of history. In Josh. xxiv. 14, the Israelites are exhorted to put away the gods which their fathers served in Mesopotamia and Egypt. Ezekiel, xxiii., reproaches the Israelites with having served idols, especially in verses 8, 19, 21. Amos says in chap. v. 25, 26: "Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? But ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch and Chiun your images, the star of your God, which ye made to yourselves." The sense of this passage (comp. the discussions in vol. ii. of the *Beiträge*, S. 109 ff.) is this: The mass of the people neglected to worship God by sacrifices during the greater part of the march through the wilderness, the thirty-eight years of exile, and in the place of Jehovah, the God of armies, put a borrowed god of heaven, whom they honoured, together with the remaining host of heaven, with a borrowed worship. These idolatrous tendencies of the Israelites in the march through the wilderness, of which Ezekiel also makes mention, chap. xx. 26, presuppose that the nation had in some measure succumbed to the temptations to idolatry during the residence in Egypt. It is also a proof of the corruption of the nation, that most of those who were led out of Egypt had to die in the wilderness before the occupation of Canaan. The whole history of the march through the wilderness is incomprehensible on the assumption that Israel remained perfectly faithful to the Lord. It can only be explained by the circumstance that the *new*, which Moses brought to Israel, consisted in a rude antithesis to the *old*. That the Israelites had practised idolatry, especially that of Egypt, is shown by the worship of demons, Lev. xvii. 7. The goats there mentioned, to which the Israelites offer sacrifice, are the Egyptian Mendes, which is honoured in the goat as its visible form and incarnation, comp. Herod. ii.

46, and a personification of the masculine principle in nature, of the active and fructifying power. It was associated with the eight highest gods of the Egyptians, chap. 145; and even took precedence among them, Diod. i. 12 f. There were also other deities of the same stamp, explaining the plural, as the Béalim in 1 Kings xviii. 18. The worship of the golden calf in the wilderness also belongs to this period. It was an imitation of the Egyptian Apis, or bull-worship. It is immaterial that in the one case it is a calf, and in the other a bull. The name of calf is everywhere contemptible. They would willingly have made an ox, but they could not bring themselves to it, because it would dishonour their entire origin. The worshippers undoubtedly called the image a bull. According to Philo, a golden bull was made; and in Ps. cvi. 20 it is said, "They changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass." The ceremonies also which the Israelites employed in this worship were Egyptian. This, therefore, was a yielding to Egyptian idolatry, even if the Hebrews, which is unquestionable, only wished to honour Jehovah in the image. Almost every participation of the Israelites in Egyptian life was of a similar kind, not a direct denial of the God of their fathers, but only an adaptation of heathen ideas to Him, resting upon a misapprehension of the wall of separation which holiness formed between Him and the heathen idols. Again, on the assumption of the absolute purity of the Israelites, it is impossible to comprehend the lively exhortations, the strict rules, and the heavy threatenings of the law against all idolatrous life, comp. Deut. iv. 15 *et seq.*; they presuppose the tendency of the nation to such deviations. On the other hand, the argument for the participation of the nation in Egyptian nature-worship, which is drawn from the symbolism of the law, is untenable. For the assumption on which it rests, that the home of symbolism is only in natural religion, has no foundation. Symbolism has nothing to do with the substance, but solely with the form, of religious consciousness. It is an embodiment, indifferent in itself. Neither is there any weight in the argument, that in many forms and symbols a more exact description is wanting. The people are supposed to be already conversant with them. Here it is forgotten that the Pentateuch in its present form was not written down until long

after the introduction of these forms and customs. Between the Sinaitic legislation and the redaction of the Pentateuch lies a period of thirty-eight years.

The correct view of the moral and religious condition of the Hebrews in Egypt has more than a mere historical importance: it is highly significant in a religious point of view. By partially giving prominence to the one side or the other, we lose sight of the most important thing in the matter, viz. its typical meaning. Those who try to represent the Israelites as pure as possible, have, notwithstanding their good intentions, done them a very bad service. The whole history of the departure from Egypt to the entrance into Canaan, is one vast, ever-recurring prophecy,—a type which, to be one, must bear in itself the essence of its antitype. The bringing out of Egypt signifies the continual leading out of God's people from the service of the world and of sin; the sojourn in the wilderness typifies their trial, sifting, and purification; the leading into Canaan, their complete induction into the possession of divine blessings and gifts, after having been thoroughly purified from the reproach of Egypt. This symbolism pervades all Scripture, as we shall show more fully in considering the march through the wilderness. If the Israelites had become altogether like the Egyptians, they could not have continued to be the people of God. There can be no period in the history of the people of God in which they exactly resemble the world. To maintain this would be to deny the faithfulness and truth of God, and to assert that He is sometimes not God. It is not without foundation that we say in the creed of the Christian Church: "I believe in the holy, catholic church." Balaam, in Num. xxiii. 10, characterizes Israel by the name ישרים, *the upright*. This predicate is always applicable to the church of God, even in times of the deepest deterioration. In her bosom she always conceals an ἐκλογή, in which her principle has attained to perfect life. And to the corrupted mass there is always a superior background: the fire which still glows in the ashes has only to be fanned in times of divine visitation. Since God's carnal blessing accompanied the cross in so marked a manner, how is it possible to conceive that He should spiritually have abandoned His people? If the Israelites had kept themselves quite pure, then the exodus would have to be regarded

merely as an external benefit, and the guidance through the wilderness would become utterly incomprehensible. The second step, that of temptation, necessarily presupposes a first, that of primary deliverance from spiritual servitude, and the first love arising out of it, whose ardent character was to be changed into one of confiding affection. Add to this, that already the external bondage of the Israelites itself afforded a proof of their internal bondage. The suffering of the people of God always appears in Scripture as a reflex of their sin: if they have given themselves up to the world, and have come to resemble it, they are punished by means of the world. How should there be an exception to the rule in this case only?

If we look at the moral and religious condition of the Israelites from this point of view, we see more clearly that it was necessary for God, in accordance with His covenant faith, to step forth from His concealment just at that time. It was not perhaps external misery alone, but rather internal misery, which gave rise to this necessity. When the carcass is in the church of God, there the eagles first collect; but then, in accordance with the same divine necessity, the dry dead bones are again animated by the Spirit of God. At that time the critical moment had arrived when the question turned upon the existence or non-existence of a people of God upon earth. But *one* century later, and there had no longer been any Israel in existence deserving of the name. What Israel had inherited from the time of the patriarchs, could not in the lapse of time hold out against the mighty pressure of the spirit of the world. A new stage of revelation must be surmounted, or that which had previously been gained would be lost.

§ 2.

THE CALL OF MOSES.

Here we take this word in a wide sense. In the call of Moses, we reckon all those preparatory dispensations of God by which he was adapted for it, from his birth to the giving of the call on Sinai. And further, we include all those means by which he was strengthened in the faith, from this first com-

mission to the commencement of the plagues, and by which he was prepared for the vocation upon which he really entered with the occurrence of this event. Until now all had been mere preparation. Now for the first time Moses is ready for the work of God. The narrative itself here breaks off into the first great section. It remarks, chap. vii. 6, that from this time Moses did as the Lord commanded him. In his former trials, human weakness was largely associated with divine power, but from this time only the latter can be perceived. In the place of probation now comes vocation. Our remarks in this paragraph include also the section Ex. ii.-vii. 7.

The work which was to be accomplished in the Mosaic time could only be completed by a distinguished personality. It is true that the people had been prepared for it by the divine guidance. The heavy suffering which they had experienced through the instrumentality of the Egyptians, the representatives of the world, had destroyed their inclination for Egyptian life, just as among us external bondage by the French destroyed the power of spiritual bondage. The traditions of antiquity had again become living; a desire for the glorious possessions which God had entrusted to this people alone among all nations of the earth was again aroused, and appears especially in the tribe of Levi, which distinguished itself in the beginning of the Mosaic time, Ex. xxxii., by zeal for the religion of Jehovah, and by reason of this zeal was appointed by the Lord to its guardianship. Comp. Deut. xxxiii. 8 sqq. But the nation did not get beyond a mere susceptibility; it had sunk too deeply to be able to attain to complete restoration, except through an instrument endowed by God with great gifts,—a man of God, in whom the higher principle should be personally represented. All great progress in the kingdom of God is called forth only by great personalities. No man has ever gone out from the mass as such, although in every reformation a preparation took place in the mass.

The deliverance granted to Moses in his childhood typified the deliverance of the whole nation from the great waters of affliction. We learn from Ps. xviii. 17 how individuals justly regarded it as a pledge of their own deliverance from distress. But a special divine providence appears most clearly in the circumstance that Moses, by deliverance, was placed in so close

a relation to the daughter of the Egyptian king, called Thermuthis by Josephus in his *Antiq.* ii. 9. 5. In the statement that she treated him as her son, chap. ii. 10, is implied what Stephen expressly says, Acts vii. 22, without giving any other proof for it than that contained in the former passage, that he had been brought up in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. This wisdom was essentially practical. It formed the foundation of the *charismata* which were afterwards imparted to Moses, and which always presuppose a human foundation. Here there was a repetition of what God had done for Joseph, who had first to be educated in the house of Potiphar for his future vocation, so important for Israel. Here was concentrated God's design in leading the whole nation into Egypt, the most civilised country then in existence. Here was realized the idea which lies at the basis of the announcement to Abraham, that his descendants should go out from Egypt with great spoil. The possession which Israel here gained was far greater than the vessels of gold and silver. Here also the divine act is a prophecy whose fulfilment extends through all time. The world collects and works in art and science for itself and its idols, collects and works in opposition to God. But faith will not be misled by this. It is only unbelief or shortsightedness which suffers itself to be led into contempt of art and science, and anxiety regarding their progress. Even here the wisdom and omnipotence of God so order things, that what has been undertaken without and against Him, turns to His advantage and to that of His people. Look, for instance, at the period of the Reformation. The re-awakened sciences had been developed mainly in the service of the world. This natural development would have led to godlessness, but suddenly Luther and the other reformers stepped forth and bore away the spoil of Egypt. It is sufficient merely to indicate how this actual prophecy is realized in our time.

But the working of special divine providence was not only manifested in the sending of Moses into this school. It was still more strongly displayed in the fact that he drew from it the good only, and not the bad. The wisdom was certainly essentially practical, but yet its foundation was pseudo-religious. How powerful, therefore, must have been the working of God's Spirit in Moses, which enabled him, while describing the snake in

the grass, to hold to the simple traditions of his fathers, unblinded by the spirit of the time, which pressed upon him on all sides, although he was obliged to search after this tradition while the false wisdom pressed upon him! How mighty must have been that efficacy which enabled him to change its letter into spirit, its acts into prophecies, whose fulfilment he sought and found with burning zeal in his own heart! It was necessary for the calling of Moses that he should be placed in the midst of the corrupt Egyptian life. It served to call forth in him a violent contest, and to give rise to a mighty crisis, without which no reformer can become ripe for his vocation. He who is destined to contend effectively with the spirit of the world, must have experienced it in its full power of temptation. Thus the negative influence of the Egyptian school was as salutary and necessary to Moses as the positive. Again, Moses was brought up at court. That he was not blinded by its splendour, nor sank into its effeminacy, that he chose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, Heb. xi. 25, is a marvel as great to him who knows the disposition of human nature, and does not measure greatness by the ell, as the subsequent external miracles which one and the same carnal mind, only in a different form, either stumbles at, or regards as the only miracles. Therefore in this respect also God's design is perfectly realized, which was to direct the glance of the people to Moses from the beginning, and so, by the manifestation of human power, to create in them a susceptibility for the subsequent ready acceptance of the proof of his divine greatness.

In Eusebius, Artapanus in the *Praep. Ev.*, and Josephus, *Antiq.* 2. 10, relate, the latter with the minutest detail, that Moses, as an Egyptian general, undertook a campaign against the Ethiopians. Attempts have been made to use this narrative to explain the knowledge of distant lands which Moses shows in the Pentateuch, and to account for his skill in war. Joh. Reinhard Forster takes great trouble to defend it; see his letter to Joh. Dav. Michaelis on the *Spicilegium Geogr. Hebr. ext.*, Goetting. 1769. But we might just as well invent such a story as accept it on authority so imperfect. The whole fable has been spun out from Num. xii. 1. Mention is there made of a Cushite wife of Moses. Zipporah is meant. In a wide sense,

the Midianites belonged to the Cushites. Or it might be that Zipporah was of a Cushite family who had immigrated into the Midianites, just as now negroes are to be found among the Arabs of the wilderness, who have been received by them into their community, according to the Countess de Gasparin's *Travels in the East*, which appeared in 1849. But it has been supposed that reference was there made to another wife of Moses; and in order to obtain her, he has been represented as having undertaken a campaign into Egypt, as having conquered Meroe and won an Ethiopian princess.

Moses' conduct towards the Egyptians gives us a deep insight into the constitution of his mind at that time. The matter has a beautiful side, which alone is made prominent in Heb. xi. 24, because it is viewed in an enumeration of examples of faith. Moses leaves the court in order to visit his suffering brethren. Love towards them, which rests upon faith, so overcomes him, that before it every consideration of his own danger disappears. Moses also here develops that natural energy which is in every reformer the substratum of those gifts necessary to his vocation. But the thing has also an evil side, which does not demand notice in the narrative, since the actual judgment on it is contained in what immediately follows; for here also history shows itself to be judgment. His princely education did not pass over him without leaving some trace. It is true that he would no longer be called a son of Pharaoh's daughter, but yet he aspired to deliver his people by his own hand. The act towards the Egyptian, which is excused, though not by any means justified, by the oppressed condition of the Israelites, was intended only as a beginning. Immediately on the following day, Moses in his reformatory haste goes out to continue the work which had been begun. He throws himself as an arbiter between two Israelites, expecting that his powerful words would be followed by absolute submission. But the matter assumed quite a different aspect. He made the experience which all self-made reformers make. He was disregarded even by those whom he wished to help, for the sake of God as he thought. In Acts vii. 25 Stephen says, "He supposed his brethren would have understood how that God by his hand would deliver them: but they understood not." Instead of delivering his people from their misery, he himself was obliged to

wander into misery, without possessions and without courage, fearing to be punished as a common murderer; for his conscience told him that he had been zealous, not for God, but for himself.

That which seemed always to exclude him from participation in the deliverance of his people, was really intended to serve as a preparation: there could not have been a worse preparation if the matter were to be accomplished by human power. God prepared a place of refuge for him, and here he was obliged to remain forty years, until he began to grow old. (It is not stated in the Pentateuch itself that the sojourn lasted so long, but only in the discourse of Stephen, Acts vii. 23-30, according to tradition; but it is confirmed by the analogy of the eighty years of Moses at the time of the deliverance, Ex. vii. 7, and by his death at 120 years of age, Deut. xxxiv. 7.) The main object was to free him from those stains which a residence at court had left, even in him, especially from pride and arrogance. His new residence was well adapted to this end. It was a true school of humility, which we afterwards recognise as a fundamental trait in the character of Moses; comp. Num. xii. 3. In the eyes of his father-in-law Hobab, the son of Raguel, who was still living at the time of Moses' coming, and stood at the head of the household, the priest of the Midianites dwelling to the east of Mount Sinai, the splendid title of Jethro, his Excellency, seems to have been the best external advantage which he derived from his office. Religion does not seem to have been highly estimated by this nation. It had perhaps come to them with the race of priests from abroad, and had taken no deep root among them. Moses was obliged to protect the daughters of the priest from the injustice of the Midianite shepherds. He himself had afterwards to do service as a shepherd, which, as the son of a king's daughter, must have cost him pride a severe struggle. When he returned to Egypt, he had only an ass for the transport of his whole family. He set his wife and child upon it, and himself walked by the side with his shepherd-staff—the same which was destined to receive so great importance as the staff of God; comp. Ex. iv. 2. It is certain that at this time he must have been in great difficulties. His marriage was also in many respects a school of affliction. The two single verses, Ex. iv. 24, 25, give a deep insight into the mind of his wife. She was so passionate and quarrelsome,

that, owing to her opposition, Moses was obliged to omit to circumcise his second son, doubtless with great sorrow, for the circumcision of the first had given rise to so much strife; and she is unable to repress her vehemence when she sees her husband in evident danger of his life, and is thus obliged to do herself what she had been unwilling for him to do. At the same time, we see plainly how little Moses had in her a companion in the faith. Circumcision, the sacrament of the covenant, she regarded only with the eyes of carnal reason. She thought it foolish to give pain to her child for the sake of such a trifle. Moses spoke directly from his own experience, when he declared himself so strongly against marriage with a heathen woman. All this was well adapted to make him weak in himself, and therefore strong in God, for the power of God is mighty in the weak. It was of great advantage to him that he was separated for a considerable time from his people. He was thus protected against that human unrest which must constantly have received new nourishment from association with them, and from the sight of their sorrow. His shepherd-life was well calculated to call forth calm reflection. Here he could transport himself vividly to the time of his ancestors, when the grace of God was so manifestly with the chosen race. Thus, while his external man gradually wasted away, his spirit was renewed from day to day. We have memorials of his disposition in the names of his two sons, Gershom and Eliezer,—"a stranger here," and "God helpeth." The former gives utterance to the complaint, the latter to the comfort.

It cannot be regarded as accidental that the call of Moses took place on Mount Sinai, from which circumstance some have assumed, without any foundation (Ewald, *Gesch. des Volk. Isr.* ii. S. 86), that it had been already consecrated before Moses, as the seat of the oracle and the habitation of the gods. For there is not the least trace to lead to such a conclusion. All the sanctity of the mountain is due to the acts of the Mosaic time. By the circumstance that he was here solemnly called to the service of God, the place receives its first consecration as the mountain of God; when the Israelites afterwards arrived there, they found it already marked with the footprints of God: it was already holy ground. The call of Moses to God's service prefigured the call of the Israelites to God's service, which was

to take place in the same spot. If history prove the former to be real and mighty, the latter must, *à priori*, be regarded as such.

It is of great importance that the manifestation which presented itself to Moses, after the supernatural revelation of God had ceased for four centuries, should not be regarded as a mere *portentum*, but that its symbolical significance should be rightly apprehended. Then it appears that the substance stands infinitely higher than the form, that the marvellous element contained in it continues through all time, and that only he whose eyes are closed can seek a natural explanation of the miracles of the past (to which department it does not belong, if the occurrence be transferred to the region of the inner sense; for by this means it loses nothing of its reality), so that he is not able to apprehend the miracles which exist in the present. A thorn-bush burning and yet not consumed, this is the symbol. The thorn-bush is the symbol of the church of God, externally small and insignificant. In Zech. i. it appears again under the symbol of a myrtle-bush—not a proud cedar on the high mountains, but a modest myrtle; and again in Isa. viii. under the image of the still waters of Shiloah, in contrast to the roaring of the Euphrates; and in Ps. xlv. under the image of a quiet river in contrast with the raging sea. Looking at the thorn-bush from this point of view, Moses himself, in Deut. xxxiii. 16, speaks of God as He who dwelt in the thorn-bush, שֹׁכֵנִי סִנָּה,—not so much He who once appeared in the physical thorn-bush, but He who continually dwells in the spiritual thorn-bush which is prefigured—in the midst of His people. Fire in the symbolism of Scripture denotes God in His essence, especially in the energetic character of His punitive justice; comp. *instar omnium*, “Our God is a consuming fire,” in the law itself, and in Heb. xii. 29. The thorn-bush burns, but is not consumed. The world is consumed by the judgment of God. For His people, the cross is a proof not only of God’s justice, but also of His love: He chastises them unsparingly, but does not give them over to death. Here we have the key to all the guidances of Israel, the key to the history of the church of the new covenant, and the key to our own guidances. For that which is applicable to the whole, is always applicable to the individual, in whom the idea of the whole is realized. We

must burn, we must enter into the kingdom of God through much tribulation; but we are not consumed: the cross is always accompanied by the blessing. What a rich theme is afforded in the words of Moses, "I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt,"—rich in proportion as personal experience has opened the eyes to the perception of the historical fact!

Again, according to the opinion of Stephen, it was in a vision that Moses saw the bush which burned with fire, and yet was not consumed. For the *ῥαμα*, by which word he designates that which he has seen in Acts vii. 31, is always applied in the New Testament to visions of the inner sense, and occurs very frequently in the Acts of the Apostles.

But the symbolical utterance of God here stands in exact relation to the verbal. The latter contains the meaning of the former. God only applies the idea which animates the symbol to the present case, in explaining to Moses, who was filled with holy awe, that He would now lead His people out of the land of the Egyptians, and into the land of promise. The command follows this promise. Moses was to lead the people out of Egypt, not, as formerly, by his own hand, but by the commission of God.

The manner in which Moses receives this commission; his lingering irresolution; his want of confidence in himself, which still suggested new scruples, desiring a special assurance from God for each doubt, although the answer to all was already contained in the universal promise, and led him to repeat even those objections which had been obviated whenever a new difficulty arose, and at last, when all escape was cut off from him, made him still hesitate to move in the matter, and led him after he had received the call to urge those difficulties made known to him by God, and designated as belonging to the matter, as a plea why he should not be sent; till at last he rises to confidence in that strength of God which is mighty in the weak, and now suddenly appears as an entirely new man: all this is important in more than one aspect. Let it be noticed especially how powerfully the character of truth is imprinted on the whole representation of the internal struggle of Moses. Where in mythical history do we find even an approach to anything similar? The heroes of mythology are of one piece—

power at the beginning, and power at the end. Here the author could not have made a greater mistake, if it had been his intention to glorify Moses. That which must deprive him of the character of a great man in the eyes of the world (forty years before he had the intention of becoming so, but now he had abandoned it), appears to have made him so much the better adapted to the purposes of God. Whence, then, arises his great hesitation? It had its foundation first in his great humility, which led him to see himself just as he was. How many think that they are undertaking a work in faith in God's help, while secret confidence in their own power lies at the foundation! Where this confidence is completely destroyed, it is very difficult to trust in God. It is easier for God to bestow confidence in His power, than to take away a man's confidence in his own power. But when He has accomplished this, those persons who have before completely despaired, turn out very different from those who have apparently trusted in God from the beginning, while in reality their confidence has been half in themselves. The latter always retain one part where they are vulnerable, if it be only the heel. They stumble and fall in the middle of the course, while Moses has everything arranged before beginning the race. His weakness therefore served only to make him the more humble. If it had overtaken him while in office, which would certainly have been the case if he had not been weak before entering upon it, then the reproach would have fallen on the cause of God. A second reason for Moses' hesitation was his sobriety. It is impossible to imagine a more direct contrast to a fanatic. The latter is raised high into the clouds by his phantasy; mountains of difficulty disappear from before his eyes. And when he descends to earth, where he is called upon to act, the actual takes the place of the imagined reality: every stone upon which he stumbles is converted into a mountain, and every actual mountain becomes as high as heaven in his eyes. His enthusiasm disappears, and sad despondency takes its place. But Moses, on the contrary, is not disconcerted by the appearance of God. All difficulties appear in their natural size. Pharaoh the mightiest monarch, Egypt the mightiest kingdom, of the then existing world; and on the other hand an aged, infirm man, of humble appearance, with his staff in his hand, scarcely able to stammer forth his commission

with his stuttering tongue. And again the difficulty which his humble appearance must present to the people themselves whom he was sent to deliver,—a people whose mind was already blunted by slavery, and who were so little able to rise to faith beyond the visible. But the very thing which was the cause of his original hesitation was the cause of his subsequent firmness. He is deterred by nothing, however unexpected. He is prepared for everything. He has fully counted the cost of building, and is therefore able to carry out the work without making himself and God a mockery to the world. In him we see clearly the distinction between enthusiasm and spirit. The former is essentially a product of nature, by which it seeks to supply the deficiency of the latter, and is the more dangerous, since it conceals this deficiency, and paralyzes the effort to supplement it.

God's dealing with Moses is just as sharply defined, and bears equally in itself the imprint of truth. It repeats itself in all believers. All pride is an abomination to God, but He has infinite patience with lowliness and weakness: comp. Isa. lxvi. 2. A fictitious God would have crushed such hesitation as Moses displayed with a word of thunder. He would have been satisfied to say, "Thou shalt,"—the words with which Pharaoh, the image of the categorical imperative which reason has exalted to God, met the complaints of the Israelites who had to make bricks, and yet received no straw. The true God, with unwearying patience, points out, "Thou canst." And it is only after He has done this, and Moses still refuses, that He threatens with His anger. Afterwards, on every relapse into his old weakness, God takes him by the hand and helps him to rise.

What God intends to do to Israel, He comprises, on His first call to Moses, in the name Jehovah, which forms a prophecy, and from this time becomes His peculiar designation among Israel. Afterwards, in chap. vi., before He begins his manifestation as Jehovah, He solemnly declares Himself once more as such. The name had been known to Israel long before; but now for the first time, and from this time through all centuries, the essence of which it was the expression was to be fully revealed to Israel, and at the same time the name was to lose that sporadic character which it had hitherto borne, and was

to pass into common use. It is remarkable, that before the Mosaic time we find so few proper names compounded with the name Jehovah. The name is properly pronounced Jahveh, and means "He is," or "the Existing" (not, as Delitzsch asserts in *die bibl. proph. Theologie*, Leipzig 1845, S. 120, "The Becoming," "the God of development;" for Scripture knows nothing of a God of development—it abandons this to pantheistic philosophy: the God of Scripture does not become, but He comes. Ex. iii. 14 is decidedly at variance with this view, however; for here *אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה* is placed in essential parallel with *אֶהְיֶה*, which can only be the case if we explain it, "I am," and "I am that I am"). The name denotes God as the pure, absolute existence, the personal existence; for it is not in the infinitive. But the name is: I am, I am the only one who is real; all others can participate in being only by community with me; besides me there is only non-existence, impotence, death. The "I am" seals the "I am that I am," constantly the same, unaffected by all change. For absolute existence excludes all change, which can only belong to existence in so far as, like all earthly existence, it has an element of non-existence. Immutability of essence necessarily implies immutability of will. So also purity of existence implies omnipotence. And if this were established, what then had Israel to expect from God? The name at once assured them of the power of their God to help them, and of His will to help them; assured them of the fact that, as omnipotent, He was able to help; and as unchangeable and true, He must help. But when God established His name Jehovah as a pledge, He gave effect to all that had been verbally predicted to the patriarchs—the deliverance out of Egypt, the possession of the land of Canaan, and the blessing on all nations. And not only this, but the whole history of the patriarchs, and all God's dealings with them, became converted into a prophecy. For God, in accordance with His repeated declaration, had acted towards them not as to individuals, but as to the ancestors of the chosen race. If what He then did was not a work of caprice, which inheres only in non-existence; if it were the efflux of His essence, and if this essence were raised above all change and hindrance, then every act of God must be revived—God *must* have mercy on the nation, or He must cease to be God. And everything

which He then did to prove His name of Jehovah, was again a prophecy, and a pledge of His future gifts.

From these remarks it is clear how suitable Jehovah was to be the theocratic, ecclesiastical name of God, which it appears to have been from this time. It stands in close relation to the name of Israel. In establishing Himself as Jehovah, God shows what He will do to the nation, and what He *must* do in accordance with the necessity of His essence. By giving the name of Israel to the nation in their ancestor, He shows what they must do in order that He may reveal Himself to them as Jehovah. The struggle with God, the faith which does not leave Him till He blesses, is the destination, but at the same time the privilege, of the people of God. For the invitation to this struggle rests upon the fact that God is Jehovah. This name is the protection against all despair, the sure rock on which the waves of the world-sea break: it beams like a sun into the earthly darkness, and brings light into the benighted soul. The privilege of Israel over all the heathen consists not in their having only *one* God, but in their having *such* a God. There is nothing in heaven or earth that can in any wise harm a nation that has such a God; there is nothing in heaven and earth that can turn away from the service of such a God. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength," has its firm foundation in the name and essence of Jehovah. A God who is unconditionally exalted above everything, the only real existence in heaven and earth, must also be unconditionally loved above everything. Here all dividing of the heart is imprudence and sin. In the name of Jehovah lies the proper world-history of the people of Israel. By this they are separated from all other nations; in this they have the pledge of a glorious future, the prophecy of the future dominion of the world. For such a God can never be permanently confined within the narrow limits of a single nation. Under Him, they can only gain life and power for the purpose of beginning the triumphal march against the world from this firm starting-point. In the Revelation of John, chap. i., the name of Jehovah is paraphrased by the words, "which is, and which was, and which is to come." God *is*, as the pure, and absolute, and unchanging being: He exists in the present, in the fulness

of that power which supplies the church; He *was*—in the past He has testified His existence by deeds of almighty love; He *is to come*—He will appear to judge the world, and for the salvation of His church, and places will then be changed. The occurrence by the way, related in chap. iv. 24 (a confirmation of the vision of the thorn-bush, which burns and yet is not consumed, in the personal experience of the leader of the people), is important in many respects. The incident must be looked at thus. On the way Moses was suddenly afflicted by severe sickness, threatening immediate death. His conscience accused him of a sin, and God or His Angel gave him an internal conviction that the malady was a punishment for this offence. From fear of his wife, he had neglected to circumcise his second son. This disturbance of the relation between him and God must necessarily be done away before he could enter on his calling. He must be under no ban. In the anguish of her heart, Zipporah now does that which she had formerly refused to allow, and the punishment is removed. But Zipporah performs this compulsory act in anger: she says to Moses passionately, “Surely a bloody husband art thou to me”—going back to the time of the beginning of her relation to him, when she might still have taken a husband from among her own people, who would not have demanded such sacrifices from her. What first impresses us here is the openness with which we are told that the honoured lawgiver himself violated the fundamental law given by God to Abraham and his posterity. This is scarcely consistent with the assumption of a later author, aiming at the glorification of Moses, but applies excellently to Moses himself, who has God’s honour always in view, and not his own. It was impossible for him to pass over in silence an act which served to glorify God—the less, since it contains so rich a treasure of exhortation for his people. (God appears no less God in the manifestation of His righteousness, than in the manifestations of His love, which was also active in this event.) If God entered into judgment in this way with His servant, who erred only through weakness, what might not proud offenders expect?

How Moses turned to his advantage the doctrine which lay nearest to him in this event, is shown by his sending back his wife and children to Midian, which undoubtedly happened in

consequence of it, and prefigured what every true servant of the Lord must do spiritually; comp. Deut. xxxiii. 9, where Moses himself declares it to be indispensable for the service of God that a man should say unto his father and his mother, "I have not seen him, and should not know his own children." That this sending back did really take place, is proved by Ex. xviii. 2, where it is related that, when the Israelites sojourned in the wilderness after the exodus from Egypt, Jethro led back to Moses his wife and children. Without doubt, the neglected circumcision was not the only thing with which Moses had to reproach himself. He had also yielded in many other points where he ought not to have yielded, and all at once this became clear to him. He feared, not without reason, that wife and child would be detrimental to him in the great work which he now went to meet, and therefore he sent them back.

Before Moses began the great battle, he was still further strengthened in the faith. The lower promises of God passed into fulfilment, and were a pledge to him of the realization of the highest. Aaron, his brother and promised helper, was led to him by God on Mount Sinai. It almost appears that Aaron's journey was connected with a revolt which arose among the people, and that all eyes turned to Moses. The people believe. Even Pharaoh's opposition seems to have tended to strengthen their faith. It had been foretold by God. To him who does not know human nature, it must appear as an internal contradiction of the narrative, that Moses should now have been destitute of courage, when that which had been foretold was fulfilled, and the nation had fallen into still greater distress. But on any knowledge of the human heart, it is evident that this contradiction is inseparable from the thing. The flesh has so great a shrinking from the cross, that at the moment the bitter feeling absorbs everything else: the impression of the visible must first be overcome by struggle.

At the conclusion of this consideration we have only one more point to discuss. God says, Ex. iv. 21, that He will harden Pharaoh's heart. In the subsequent narrative it is ten times repeated that God has hardened Pharaoh's heart, and it is said just as often that Pharaoh hardened his heart. Here the similarity of number points to the fact that the hardening of Pharaoh is related to the hardening of God,

which is designedly mentioned first and last, as the effect to the cause.

The whole spirit of the Pentateuch renders it impossible to suppose that this representation makes God the original cause of sin. The whole legislation rests on the presupposition of individual responsibility. The threatenings appended to the breaking of the covenant, and the promises attached to the faithful observance of it, Lev. xxvi., Deut. xxviii. sqq., most decisively presuppose this. Pharaoh himself is looked upon as an offender who deserves punishment.

The semblance of injury to the idea of responsibility also disappears at once if we only consider that the hardening had reference throughout not to the sin in itself, but to the form of its expression—to his obstinate refusal to let Israel go. Pharaoh had power to relent, and the fact that he did not relent proves his guilt and the justice of his punishment. But because he *would* not, the form in which the sin expressed itself was no longer in his own power, but in the power of God, which is the case with all sinners. God so arranges it as to consist with His own plans. He who turneth the hearts of kings like water-brooks, makes Pharaoh persist in not allowing Israel to go (which he might have done without, however, being in the least better), that an opportunity might thus be given to Him to develop His essence in a series of acts of omnipotence, justice, and love. It was most important to draw attention to this cause of Pharaoh's hardening. If it were not recognised, his long resistance to God would have been perplexing; but if it were recognised, then Pharaoh's resistance serves no less to the glory of God than to his own destruction. Calvin strikingly remarks on the kindred passage in Ps. cv. 25, "He turned their heart to hate His people, to deal subtilely with His servants:" "We see how the prophet designedly makes it his object to subject the whole government of the church to God. It might suffice for us to learn that God frustrates whatever the devil and godless men may design against us; but we receive double confirmation in the faith when we perceive that not only are their hands bound, but also their hearts and minds, that they can determine nothing but what God pleases."

§ 3.

THE DELIVERANCE OUT OF EGYPT.

Ex. vii. 8, to the end of chap. xv.

Now begins the struggle of God with the world and the visible representative of its invisible head,—the latter adapted for this representation by their moral abandonment, no less than their power, which ends in their complete overthrow. Now begins a series of events which are at the same time so many prophecies. The gradual progressive victory of God and His people over Pharaoh, the mightiest ruler of the then existing world, and his kingdom, is a pledge of the victory of God and his church over the whole region of darkness, and that subservient world-power which is at enmity with God, and appears in Revelation under the image of the beast with seven heads, of which Egypt is the first. The number of the Egyptian plagues is generally estimated at eleven. But they are rather completed, certainly with design, in the number ten, the signature of that which is complete in itself, of that which is concluded in Scripture. For that miracle which is generally regarded as the first, the changing of Moses' staff into a serpent, is not to be reckoned among them. It is distinguished from the others by the fact that it is not, like them, punishment at the same time, but is only a proof of the omnipotence of God, and not a proof of His justice. It is distinguished also by the circumstance that it follows the demand of Pharaoh, while the others are forced upon him. It may be regarded as a sort of prelude, as if somebody were to fire into the air before aiming at the enemy, in order to see if by this means he will be brought to his senses. And at the same time we must regard it as a symbol, as an actual prophecy of all that was to follow. The staff of Moses which was changed into a serpent, is an image of the covenant people, weak in themselves, but able by God's power to destroy the mightiest kingdom of the world; an image of Moses, who, considered in himself, was scarcely dangerous to a child, but as God's servant formidable to the mightiest monarch in the world.

Let us now turn our attention to the object of these facts. It is given by God Himself in His address to Pharaoh, chap.

ix. 15, 16: "For now I will stretch out my hand, that I may smite thee and thy people with pestilence; and thou shalt be cut off from the earth. And in very deed for this cause have I raised thee up, for to show in thee my power; and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth." God will be known upon the earth in His true character. Hence He who could have settled the whole matter with one stroke, developes His essence perfectly in a series of facts; hence He hardens the heart of Pharaoh. This revelation of the divine essence had reference first to the Egyptians. In this respect it is on a level with other judgments on the heathen world—the flood, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the expulsion of the Canaanites. The time to restrain the corruption of the world in an internal and efficacious way had not yet come; but that it might come at a future time, retributive justice must permeate the destinies of nations, humble their pride, and break their power. This was the preliminary part in God's hand. This was the condition of future closer communion; comp. Isa. xxvi. 9, 10. With proud disdain Pharaoh had challenged God with the words, "Who is Jehovah, that I should obey his voice?" This question demands a real answer; and the more boldly the question is repeated, the more obstinately Pharaoh rebels against the God who has already revealed Himself, the more his guilt is increased by this circumstance, the more perceptibly must the answer resound till the final, complete destruction of the defiant rebel. The divine *jus talionis* which realizes itself throughout the whole history must also be exemplified in him—must be most unmistakeably exemplified in him, that it may also be recognised elsewhere, where it is more concealed. Because God could not glorify Himself in Pharaoh, He must be glorified by him. Pharaoh must repay what he had robbed—by his possessions, by his child, by his life. And in treating of the meaning of the plagues for Egypt, it seems right that we should enter somewhat more closely into this passage, Ex. xii. 12, "And against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment." According to the assertion of v. Hofmann, which is adopted by Baumgarten, Delitzsch, and others, this passage implies that in the plagues God manifested His omnipotence and justice not only to the Egyptians, but also to the spiritual powers to whom Egypt belonged. Spiritual

rulers, he maintains, are at work in the corporeal world. They are spirits but not original, and are powerful, but only where the Creator allows them to have sway. But even if these powers, which are only the product of phantasy, really did exist, the passage could not have reference to them. For the question here is not of subordinate spirits, but of gods. Those passages in the New Testament which v. Hofmann cites in favour of their existence have no weight. In 1 Cor. viii. 5, ὡςπερ εἰσὶ θεοὶ πολλοὶ, καὶ κύριοι πολλοί, and the preceding λεγόμενοι θεοί, have reference only to an existence in the heathen consciousness; and in 1 Cor. x. 16–21, a demoniacal background of heathendom is only asserted in general; the real existence of separate heathen deities is not taught. Since, therefore, all Scripture teaches the non-existence of the heathen deities, and since the scriptural idea of God excludes their reality (comp. *Beiträge*, Bd. ii. S. 248), we can only refer the judgment contained in this passage respecting the gods of Egypt to the circumstance that by those events their nothingness was made manifest, and they were proved to be mere λεγόμενοι θεοί. It is clear that the presupposition that idols have no existence beyond what is merely material, lies at the basis of the two passages, Lev. xix. 4, "Turn ye not unto idols, nor make to yourselves molten gods;" and xxvi. 1, "Ye shall make you no idols nor graven image, neither rear you up a standing image, neither shall ye set up any image of stone in your land, to bow down unto it." The assumption of their nothingness has its foundation in this. The passage, Isa. xli. 24, "Behold, ye are of nothing, and your work of nought," which serves to explain the Elilim, is preceded by "do good or do evil," as a proof that the non-existence of the gods is absolute. The whole sharp polemic against idolatry contained in the second part of Isaiah, especially in the classic passage chap. xlv. 9–24, rests upon the presupposition that idols do not exist apart from images. This is explicitly stated in Ps. xlv. 5, and copiously proved in Ps. cxv., in expansion of the Mosaic passage, Deut. iv. 28, "And there ye shall serve gods, the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell"—are less than the man who fashions them, which is perfectly clear, and which in itself forms a sufficient refutation of v. Hofmann. Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* S. 109) appeals to Ex. xv. 11 in support of his theory,

where it is said that Jehovah is not like to any among the gods. But it is proved by Ps. lxxxvi. 8, that in this and similar passages the gods are only imaginary. We only add that Kurtz, *Gesch. des A. B. S.* 86 *sqq.*, mistakes the meaning of the whole thing. The question is not whether heathendom has a demoniacal background. This is recognised by all Christendom. Scripture bears clear testimony to it in those passages which we have already cited, and experience confirms it. The question is, whether individual heathen deities, such as Apollo and Minerva, have or have not a real existence. Scripture determines the latter; and with this determination science goes hand in hand; for we can clearly prove a human origin in a succession of heathen deities. This, therefore, is the reference which the wonders and signs had to Egypt. But the reference of the Egyptian plagues to Israel was of infinitely greater importance. By these events Elohim was to become Jehovah to them. Here He manifested Himself as such in a series of days more powerfully than He had formerly done in centuries. His omnipotence and grace were now openly displayed. We have a repetition of the history of the creation in miniature. There everything was created for the human race; here everything created, departing from its ordinary course, was designed for the salvation of the chosen race, and for the destruction of its enemies. Thus the God who had hitherto been concealed became manifest and living to Israel, an object of grateful love. They could say, with Job: "I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee." What these events were intended to convey to Israel we learn from Ex. x. 1, 2, where it is said: "I have hardened his heart, and the heart of his servants, that I might show these my signs before him: and that thou mayest tell in the ears of thy son, and of thy son's son, what things I have wrought in Egypt, and my signs which I have done among them." But we recognise it most fully in seeing what these events became to them. When everything visible seems to deny that the Lord is God, then the faith of the Psalmist clings to no actual proof of this great and difficult truth with such firmness as to this; comp. Ps. cv. When the prophets wish to remove the doubts which the flesh opposed to their announcement of the future wonderful exaltation of the now lowly kingdom of God, they

constantly go back to this time when the invisible power of God made itself visibly manifest—to this type of the last and greatest redemption. When all around is gloom, and the Lord seems to have quite forsaken His people, the believing spirit penetrates into these facts, and sees them revive.

But we must not overlook the close connection between such events and the legislation which follows. This is evident from the fact that the latter began with the words, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." God surrenders Himself to Israel before requiring that Israel should surrender itself to Him. Here also He remains faithful to His constant method of never demanding before He has given. Love to God is the foundation of obedience to Him; and it is impossible to love a mere idea, however exalted. The language of revelation is throughout, "Let us love Him, for He first loved us."

But these events are also a preparation for the giving of the law, in so far as they guarantee Moses, the mediator between God and the nation, as such. In the narrative itself, Ex. xiv. 31, this is stated to have been the result: "And the people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and His servant Moses." Announced by Moses, the divine signs are ushered in; at his command they disappear; his staff is the staff of God, his hand the hand of God. As a sign that God allows all the wonders to take place through his mediation, he must always begin by stretching out his hand and staff over Egypt. Moses could not afterwards have demanded so severe things in the commission of God, if he had not now given so great things in the same commission. By these deeds the better self of the nation was raised in Moses to the centre of its existence, and the success of its reaction against the corruption which had begun to permeate the nation was secured.

But the events are of the greatest importance for the Christian church no less than for Israel. It is true that we have before us the last and most glorious revelation of God. Compared with redemption in Christ, the typical deliverance out of Egypt falls into the background, as was already foretold under the old covenant: comp. Jer. xxiii. 7, 8, xvi. 14, 15. But we cannot know too much of God. Every one of His actions makes Him more personal, brings Him nearer to us.

If, like the Psalmist and the prophets, we look upon these events not as dead facts, if we do not adhere to the shell, we shall find them to contain an unexpected treasure. Our flesh so readily obscures God's grace and righteousness, that we must be sincerely thankful for that mirror from which its image shines out upon us. Moreover, the Pharaoh in our hearts is so well concealed, that we greatly need such an outward illumination for his unveiling.

If we now look at the form and matter of the miracles, we see some analogy to each in the natural condition of Egypt, the agency of which had only to be strengthened, and which had to be secured against every natural derivation by circumstances such as the commencement and ceasing of them at the command of Moses, in part at a time determined by Pharaoh himself, and by the sparing of the Israelites. The same thing takes place afterwards in the miracles in the wilderness. Miracle-explainers, such as Eichhorn, have sought to find in this a confirmation of their interpretations. But De Wette has already disproved this: in his *Krit. der Israel. Gesch.* S. 193 (*Beiträge z. Einl. in d. A. T.* ii.), he shows that every attempt to explain miracles as they are described in the narrative in a natural way, is vain. Apart from all else, how could they have had such an effect on Pharaoh and on Israel? But these miracle-explainers are like Pharaoh himself, who may be looked upon as their father. Unable to recognise the finger of God, they anxiously look for anything which can serve as a palliation of their want of faith. If they and the mythicists who make this union with nature an argument that the Egyptian plagues belong to the region of poetry, would consider the thing impartially, they would see that the very character of the miracles attests their truth and divinity. In this respect, God's mode of dealing remains always the same. As a rule, He attached His extraordinary operations to His ordinary ones. We have only to look at the analogy in the spiritual department, where there is no χάρισμα which has not a natural talent as its basis. In a mythical representation, all that the author knew of the wonderful or terrible would be heaped up, without any reference to the natural condition of Egypt; and if he were acquainted with that natural state, he would even avoid everything which might favour an explanation by it, and so

apparently lessen the miracle. The universal ground for this condition of the supernatural in Scripture is, that it places even the natural in the closest relation to God. The attempt to isolate the miraculous can only consist with godlessness. But here there was a special reason. The object to which all facts tended was, according to chap. viii. 18, to prove that Jehovah the Lord was in the midst of the land. And this proof could not be substantially conducted if a series of strange horrors were introduced. From them it would only follow that Jehovah had received an occasional and external power over Egypt. On the other hand, if yearly recurring results were placed in relation to Jehovah, it would be shown very properly that He was God in the midst of the land. At the same time, judgment would be passed on the imaginary gods which had been put in His place, and they would be completely excluded from the regions which had been regarded as peculiar to them.

It would lead us too far to prove in detail how a natural substratum is present throughout all the plagues, while in none is a natural explanation admissible. For this we refer to the treatise, "The Signs and Wonders in Egypt," in *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, p. 93 *sqq.*

The miracles are taken from the most various departments. That which was a blessing to Egypt is converted into a curse; the hurtful which was already in existence is increased to a fearful degree. The smallest animals become a terrible army of God. In this way, it was shown that every blessing which ungrateful Egypt attributed to its idols originated with Jehovah, and that it was He alone who checked the efficacy of that which was injurious.

With respect to Pharaoh, Calvin remarks: "Nobis in unius reprobi persona superbiæ et rebellionis humanæ imago sub-jicitur." This is the kernel of the whole representation. Everything is so represented that each one can find it out; and what is still more, all the arrangements of God are such that this obduracy must be apparent. The hardness of heart is important for us in a double aspect: first, in so far as it originated with Pharaoh, who was not brought to repent even by the heaviest strokes, and so to ward off that fate which led him with irresistible power step by step to his destruction; and again—and on this the narrator's eye is specially fixed—in so far as the greatness of God manifests itself in the incomprehen-

sible blindness with which Pharaoh goes to meet his ruin, compelling him to do what he would rather not have done. The greatness of human corruption is seen in the fact that he will not desist from sin; the greatness of God, in the fact that he is not able to desist from that form of sin in which it is madness to persevere. Every sinner stands under such a fate, from whose charmed circle he can only escape by the *salt mortale* of repentance. It is the curse of sin, that it lowers man to a mere involuntary instrument of the divine plans. At the first interview Moses dare not yet reveal the whole counsel of God. Now, and even afterwards, he demands not the complete release of the people, but only permission to hold a festival in the wilderness. There was no deception in this. When God gave the command, He ordered that the request should be put in such a form that Pharaoh would not listen to it. If he had complied with it, which was not possible, Israel would not have gone beyond the demand. But the object was only that, by the smallness of the demand, Pharaoh's obstinacy might be more apparent. He refuses the simple request, and only oppresses the Israelites the more, while he mocks their God. After some little time Moses and Aaron repeated their demand, this time with far greater assurance, representing the misery which the king would bring upon his own people by non-compliance. He becomes obstinate; and instead of proving the goodness of the cause by internal grounds, he asks a sign. Ungodliness always seeks some plausible pretence which may pass for the spirit of proof. What need was there here for a sign? His conscience told him that he had no right to retain Israel; and the inner voice of God convinced him that the outward command to let them go emanated from God. Nevertheless God granted him what he desired, that the nature of his obstinacy might become visible, and that the depth of human corruption on the one side, and on the other side the energy of God's righteousness and the infinitude of His power, might be made manifest. Nevertheless, in conformity with God's constant method in nature and history, the matter was so arranged that unbelief always retained some hook to which it could adhere; for God always gives light enough even for weak faith, at the same time leaving so much darkness that unbelief may continue its night-life. The miracle of the conversion of the staff into the serpent was

imitated by the Egyptians; and thus Pharaoh was punished for the confidence which he had placed in these idolaters, to the neglect of the true God. But, at the same time, the circumstance that the serpent of Moses devoured the serpents of the priests must have convinced any one of candour and judgment, that the secret arts owed their efficacy only to God's permission. Pharaoh had not this candour and judgment. His sinful corruption had robbed him of goodwill, and God had deprived him of insight and wisdom. He anxiously seized the feeble support. Now begin those signs which are at the same time punishment. In the first two it happened as in the case of the previous sign. Again a handle was given to Pharaoh's unbelief. The servants of the idols imitated, though only in a small way, what the servants of God had done on a large scale. If Pharaoh had had any willingness and insight, this could not have deceived him. The inner *criteria* always remained; and even when looked at externally, he might have been easily convinced that what the sorcerers had accomplished did not happen by their independent power, but only by the permission of the same God by whose power the works of Moses and Aaron were effected: he might have seen that the enchanters were not able to remove evil, but only to increase it. And in the second miracle this did make some impression on Pharaoh. He was obliged to appeal to the servant of God for a remedy, which was granted at the exact time appointed by Pharaoh himself, to whom Moses had left the determination. But when Pharaoh saw that he was extricated, he hardened his heart. Where the divine has no inner point of contact with the spirit, its outward appearance can only operate so long as it exists in the immediate present: once let it disappear from the present, and immediately unbelief, and that foolishness which is bound up with it by God's order and decree, assert themselves, and in the place of real wonders put the *monstra* of a sceptical interpretation. If my priests have been able to do so much, Pharaoh thought, then in certain circumstances they will be able to do this much also. It is accidental that these circumstances are not now present, and they will soon come. The third plague succeeds. The divine permission completely ceases, and with it also the power of the Egyptian wise men. Pharaoh is forsaken by his own

helpers. Less hardened than he, they say, "It is the finger of God," that is, "they have gained the victory by the power of God, and by this means God has decided in favour of their cause." Elohim here expresses the universal idea of the God-head, which has never quite disappeared even from heathendom. But Pharaoh remains unsoftened. In the fourth miracle, and those which follow, there enters an element not present in the earlier ones, which, as it appears, was calculated to put to shame even the most obstinate unbelief. While all the rest of Egypt is groaning under the plagues, the land of Goshen, the principal residence of the Israelites, is spared. But Pharaoh is stubborn, and still relies upon what his priests accomplished in the earlier miracles. In some cases the pressure of misery extorted from him the confession, "I have sinned against Jehovah your God, and against you," and a demand for help; but scarcely is this granted, when the old hardness returns. Even his courtiers, compliant at other times, at last forsake him. "Let the people go," they say, "that they may serve the Lord their God; knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed?" But so terrible is the power of sin which keeps back from repentance, so formidable the power of the divine hardening which leads him who will not turn, with open eyes towards the abyss, that Pharaoh will rather let his land and people be destroyed than yield. All this was not unexpected by Moses. Before each plague God fortells him that he will harden Pharaoh, and therefore that Pharaoh will harden himself. Nevertheless Moses must always go first to Pharaoh, to repeat his demand and desire the release. The hardening of Pharaoh must be made manifest to the whole world, and therefore a looking-glass is held up in which it may see its own countenance, and at the same time God's righteousness and omnipotence. Finally comes the decisive blow, the death of the first-born. The hardness disappears for the moment. With a strong hand Pharaoh drives out the Israelites; but they are scarcely out of his sight when he repents of his determination, the hardness which could only have been completely removed by true repentance returns, and the great drama concludes with the only conclusion worthy of it—the death of the rebel.

There are three opinions respecting the results produced by the Egyptian priests. 1. Some believe that they wrought

their works by natural means, especially by sleight of hand. This view is to be found already in the book of Wisdom xvii. 7, where the works of the priests are called *μαγικῆς τέχνης ἐμπαύματα*; then in Philo, where they are termed *ἀνθρώπων σοφίσματα καὶ τέχνας πεπλασμέναις πρὸς ἀπάτην*; and in Josephus, who calls them *τέχνην ἀνθρωπίνην καὶ πλάνην*, *Antiq.* ii. 13. 3. It is specially defended by von Heumann, *de Pharaonis thaumaturgis*, in his *Opusc.* 2. Others regard these enchantments as a work of deception, due to the instrumentality of evil spirits, who so bewitched the minds of the spectators, that the things produced on them all the impression of reality. So also several of the Church Fathers; for example, Justin and Gregory of Nyssa. The former says: "But that which happened by means of the magicians was due to the efficacy of demons, who enchanted the eyes of the spectators, so that they mistook what was not a serpent for a serpent, what was not blood for blood, and what were not frogs for frogs." 3. Others assert that the miracles were true miracles, only differing from those of Moses and Aaron by the circumstance that the latter were accomplished by the omnipotence of God, and the former by divine permission through the instrumentality of evil spirits. So, for example, Theodoret, who remarks: "God permitted the enchanters to effect something, that the distinction between those wonders which were truly divine, and those which were the result of enchantment, might be made more apparent. They change their staves into serpents, but the serpent of Moses devours theirs; they change water into blood, but are not able to change it back again, etc." For the chastisement of Egypt, he says, God gave power to the magicians, but not in order to remove the punishment. Since the king was not content with the plagues sent by God, but commanded the magicians to increase the punishment, God punished him through their instrumentality. "Thou hast not enough in the punishment by my servants, therefore I will punish thee by thine own servants also." That their power was only lent, is sufficiently shown by their incapacity regarding the smallest animals, the *σκνῖδες*. The sores on their own bodies were also a proof of lack of power. We are not at liberty to doubt that there are such miracles, say the defenders of this view, for Scripture expressly asserts it. Thus Moses speaks of the signs

and wonders of false prophets, Deut. xiii. 1. The Lord Himself says, "There shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders," Matt. xxiv. 24. The *τέρατα ψεύδους*, 2 Thess. ii. 9, are miracles done in the service and for the furtherance of deceit. Here we take occasion to remark that the lying wonders there spoken of are rather false miracles. The lying corresponds to the deceivableness in the verse which immediately follows.

Of these three views, only the first and third can come under consideration, for the second is destitute of all foundation and analogy in Scripture. But which of the two views is the correct one, the narrative does not put us in a position to determine. For the object of the narrative, it is of no consequence to clear up this point. The significance of the facts remained the same, whether they were accomplished in the one way or the other. They were always means in God's hand, which He employed to realize His decree of hardening. The shadow must always serve to throw up the light of the truly divine wonders. It is said that the priests did the things בִּלְהַטִּיחֵם, Ex. vii. 11, 22, viii. 3, 14; לִהְיוֹת or לִטִּיחֵם are not exclusively enchantments, but generally secret arts. It is stated that the priests did the same as Moses, but nothing is said as to how they did it. When, for instance, we read, "Now the magicians of Egypt, they also did in like manner with their enchantments; for they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents; but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods,"—this does not imply that the Egyptian wise men really changed ordinary rods into serpents, "dry wood into living flesh," but only that they imitated the miracles of Moses in so illusive a way, that no difference could be proved in the outward manifestation. The record only keeps to that which passed before the eyes of the spectators. It does not trouble itself as to the nature of the arts which the wise men employed to procure rods which they could make alive. It has no object in entering into this argument. Apart from it, the victory of Moses is secure and manifest.

The first view, however, must be ennobled before it can be approved of. The Egyptian wise men are by no means to be regarded as ordinary jugglers: it must of necessity be recognised that they stood in an elevated state, wherein they had

at their service powers which, though certainly natural, were very unusual. This appears especially from the analogy of the serpent-charming which still exists in Egypt (comp. *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, p. 98 *sqq.*). That very analogy, which evidently stands in close connection with the events in question, shows us that the theory which sees real miracles in them is untenable, the more so because one of the actions recorded has a striking relationship to what is still done by the serpent-charmers. It is said in the *Descr.* t. xxiv. p. 82 *sqq.*: "They can change the *hajje*, a kind of serpent, into a stick, and compel it to appear as if dead." If we do not regard this as a miracle, although no explanation has yet been successful and the circumstance is still veiled in mystery, then we cannot look upon these things as miracles.

Moreover, tradition has handed down to us the names of the Egyptian enchanters, which Moses does not mention. Paul, in 2 Tim. iii. 8, calls them Jannes and Jambres; and we find the same names in the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem; also in the Talmud, and in heathen writers, in Pliny, Apuleius, and the Pythagorean Numenius in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* ix. chap. 8. But the correctness of the tradition is not attested by the apostolic passage. The apostle plainly mentions the Egyptian magicians in a connection in which he attaches no importance to their names. He only calls them by the name current in his time. With reference to the alleged borrowing of the vessels of the Egyptians by the Israelites, there is nothing easier than to show that no such borrowing can here be meant—which nothing could justify—but that the passages in question can only be understood of spontaneous presents made by the Egyptians. The assumption of borrowing has its basis in two interpretations of words equally unfounded. 1. The verb לשאל is quite arbitrarily interpreted "to lend;" שאל means in Hiphil, "to make another ask." This, then, has reference to voluntary and unasked gifts, in contrast to such as are bestowed only from fear, or in order to get rid of importunity. He who gives voluntarily invites another, as it were, to ask, instead of being himself moved to give by the request. So in 1 Sam. i. 28, the only other passage where the Hiphil is found. 2. The verb לגנב has been interpreted to *steal*, a meaning which it never has,

but rather that of robbery, of a forcible taking away, which does not at all agree with the assumption of crafty borrowing. But in what respect could the spontaneous gift be looked upon as a robbery? How does this agree with the fact that, in the two passages, chap. xi. 2 and xii. 36, it is expressly made prominent by the words, "And the Lord gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians," that the vessels were a voluntary gift to the Hebrews, prompted by the goodwill of the Egyptians, through the influence of God, so that fear alone cannot be regarded as the efficient cause? The only possible mode of reconciliation is this: The robber, the spoiler, is God. He who conquers in battle, carries away the booty. The author makes it prominent that the Israelites left Egypt, laden, as it were, with the spoil of their mighty enemies, as a sign of the victory which the omnipotence of God had vouchsafed to their impotence. Thus understood, the fact is not only justifiable, but appears as a necessary part of the whole: it acquires the importance which is attributed to it in the Pentateuch, which had been foretold to Abraham, and to Moses when he was first called. One of the greatest proofs of God's omnipotence, and of His grace towards His people, is seen in the fact that He moves the hearts of the Egyptians not merely to fear, but to love, those whom they had formerly despised, and had now so much reason to hate. The material value of the gifts was insignificant, compared with the value which they had for Israel as a sign or proof of what God can and will do for His people. The vessels of the Egyptians had become holy vessels in the strictest sense, from which we may infer that in the presentation of free-will offerings for the holy tabernacle in the wilderness, these must have formed a large proportion. Comp. Num. iv. 7, Ex. xxxv.

Before the exodus from Egypt three very important institutions were inaugurated by Moses, at the divine command:— (1.) He gave a law respecting the beginning of the year. In the Mosaic time, and even long afterwards, until the time of the captivity the Hebrews had no names for their months, which were only counted; the Israelites first took the names of their months from the Persians: comp. Stern and Benfey on the names of the months of some ancient nations. No single name of a month appears in the Pentateuch. Formerly the

Israelites had begun the year with the later month Tisri, which corresponds to our October; from this time the current month, afterwards called Nisan, was to be their first month, as a memorial of the exodus from Egypt. Josephus says, however, in his *Antiq. Jud.* i. 1, chap. 3, § 3, that the change had reference only to the beginning of the ecclesiastical year, whereas the civil year began at the same time afterwards as before. It appears from Lev. xxv. 9 that this happened in accordance with the design of the lawgiver, that the new beginning of the year had reference only to the character of Israel as the people of God, while the former retained its meaning for the natural side; for it is here stated that the Sabbath and jubilee year, which exercised so great an influence on the civil relations, began with the former beginning of the year, while the month of the exodus already in the law forms the beginning of the ecclesiastical year: comp. Lev. xxiii. 5; Num. ix. 1, 2, 11. The new commencement of the year points to the fact that, with the deliverance of the people out of Egypt, they had arrived at a great turning-point; that with this event the nation had acquired a spiritual in addition to its natural character. (2.) The feast of the passover was instituted. This is generally regarded as a mere memorial, and it did bear that character; but such was far from forming its principal significance, just as little as the Lord's Supper in the New Testament, which corresponds to it. In true religion there cannot be a mere memorial feast. It recognises nothing as absolutely past. Its God Jehovah, the existing, the unchangeable, makes everything old new.

But with special reference to the feast of the passover, the continuance of the slaughter of a lamb as an offering proves that it cannot be regarded as a mere memorial feast. The Easter lamb is expressly termed "a sacrifice," Ex. ii. 27, xxiii. 18, xxxiv. 25. It was slaughtered in holy places, Deut. xvi. 5 sqq.; and after the sanctuary had been erected, its blood was sprinkled and its fat burnt on the altar, 2 Chron. xxx. 16, 17, xxxv. 11. The Jews have always regarded it as a sacrifice. Philo and Josephus call it *θύμα* and *θυσία*. In a certain sense, it belonged to the class of *זבחים*, to those sacrifices of which the givers received a part. But this designation has reference solely to the form, to the communion here associated with the

sin-offering. That it was essentially a sacrifice of atonement, appears from Ex. xii. 11, 12, and xxii. 23. Israel was to be spared in the divine punishment which broke forth over Egypt—the death of the first-born. But lest they should ascribe this exemption to their own merit, that it might not lead them to arrogance but gratitude, the deliverance was made dependent on the presentation of an offering of atonement. Whoever then, or at any time, should slaughter the paschal lamb, made a symbolical confession that he also deserved to be an object of divine wrath, but that he hoped to be released from its effect by the divine grace which accepts a substitute. Where there is a continued sacrifice, offered in faith, there must also be a continued atonement: there must be a repetition of that first benefit, which is only distinguished by the fact that it forms the starting-point of the great series—that with it this first relation of God came into life. The passover must not be placed in too direct connection with the sparing of the first-born. In harmony with its name redemption, and then atonement- or reconciliation-offering, it has to do first of all only with atonement, and the forgiveness of sins which is based on it. But where sin has disappeared, there can no longer be any punishment for sin. Again, there is no doubt that the passover stands in a certain relation to the exodus from Egypt. But here also the connection must not be made too direct. That the Lord led His people with a strong hand out of Egypt, from the house of bondage, was only a consequence and an issue of the fundamental benefit He had conferred on them by the institution of the passover-offering for atonement and forgiveness of sins. Israel was to be brought out from the bondage of the world and its fellowship. It was to be raised to the dignity of an independent people of God, separate from the heathen. But before this would or could happen, the only true wall of partition was erected between them and the world. The blood of atonement was granted to them, and in it the forgiveness of their sins. It was not without an object that the passover was held in the harvest month. The harvest was not to be touched before the feast of the passover. According to Ex. xxiii. 19–24, comp. Lev. xxiii. 9 *sqq.*, the first sheaf was to be brought to the Lord on the second day of the feast, as an

acknowledgment of indebtedness to Him for the whole blessing. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." This seeking the kingdom of God consists mainly in looking for forgiveness of sins in the blood of atonement. The request for daily bread is only justified in the mouth of those who have a reconciled God. After determining the nature of the passover feast, it will not be difficult to point out its relation to circumcision. The feast of the passover presupposed circumcision. It is expressly laid down that no uncircumcised person is to eat of it. When circumcision was omitted in the wilderness at the divine command, the feast of the passover was also discontinued, and only recommenced after circumcision had been again accomplished under Joshua. By the sacrament of circumcision the people of Israel became the people of God, and every individual a member of this people; by the sacrament of the passover they received the actual divine assurance that God would not reject them on account of their sins of infirmity, that of His mercy He would forgive them, and would not withdraw His blessing from them. From this it follows that the passover, sometimes termed the feast, has quite another meaning than all the other Israelitish feasts; and also that it must precede all others. By the institution of the passover, Israel was first put fully into a condition adapted to the reception of God's commands. That the passover lamb was not merely slaughtered but eaten, symbolized the appropriation of redeeming grace. The bitter herbs, which were eaten as vegetables, typified the sorrows by which the elect are visited for their salvation; the unleavened bread, the *εἰλικρίνεια* and *ἀλήθεια* which they must practise. For leaven is the symbol of corruption, in antiquity. That the children of Israel were obliged to eat the passover with their travelling-staves in their hands, with girded loins and shod feet, points to the zeal with which the redeemed must walk in the ways of God, and to the fact that idle rest does not become them.

3. Then followed the consecration of the first-born. This was intended to keep in remembrance throughout the whole year, what the passover, in so far as it was a memorial feast, testified once a year. The representation of the sparing of the

first-born in Egypt, at the same time a pledge of future grace, was intended to penetrate the whole life. Every first-born by his simple existence proclaimed aloud the divine mercy; his consecration was an embodiment of the exhortation "Be thankful." The manner of consecration varied, however; clean animals were offered up, clean ones compensated for the unclean, the first-born among men were redeemed. The assumption that the clean animals fell to the lot of the priests rests on a mere misunderstanding of the passage, Num. xviii. 18, where it is only said that the same portions of the sacrifices of the first-born should fall to the priests which are due to them of all the heave-offerings. As of all the heave-offerings so of this also God first received His portion, then the priests, and the rest was consumed in holy feasts.

In the narrative of the exodus of the Israelites our attention is first arrested by the passage, Ex. xiii. 21, "And the Lord went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light, to go by day and night." That the pillar of cloud and of fire should be mentioned just here, after the account of the arrival of the children of Israel in Etham, has no basis in chronology, but only one in fact. We stand immediately before the passage through the sea, in which the symbol of the divine presence, which was probably discontinued immediately on the Israelites' departure, was to unfold its whole meaning. The best that has been said concerning this symbol is given by Vitranga in the treatise *de Mysterio facis igneae* "Israelitis in Arabia prælucentis," in his *Observv. Sacr.* i. 5, 14-17. There is much, it is true, that is arbitrary and unfounded. The symbol of the divine presence first mentioned here, led the Israelites afterwards in their whole march through the wilderness. After the erection of the holy tabernacle it descended upon it. In Ex. xl. 38 it is said, "The cloud was upon the tabernacle by day, and fire was on it by night, in the sight of all the house of Israel, throughout all their journeys." With reference to the outward appearance of this symbol, it seems that we have not to think of a gross material fire: Ex. xxiv. 17, "And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire." Vitranga: "Ignis speciem habuit, veris ignis non fuit." The pillar of cloud and of fire was not the Angel of the Lord Himself, who, on the contrary,

is expressly distinguished from it, Ex. xiv. 19. When the Egyptians approach Israel, the Angel of the Lord first betakes himself from the head of Israel to the rear, between them and the Egyptians. Then the pillar of cloud also leaves its place, from which it appears that this was only the abode of the Angel of the Lord, the outward sign of His presence, and that He Himself was not shut up within it. Vitringa: "*Vides columnae nubis jungi angelum tanquam illius hospitem eam inhabitantem.*" The form is characterized by the name of a pillar. It rose, like a pillar of smoke from earth to heaven, and spread its glory by night far over the camp of the Israelites. Although a pillar of cloud and fire is generally spoken of, yet it cannot be doubted that both were one and the same phenomenon, which only presented a different aspect by day and by night. By night the fire shone out more clearly from the dark covering. This appears from Ex. xiv. 20, where one and the same cloud produces a double effect, covering the Egyptians with darkness, and at the same time illumining the camp of the Israelites. Hence it is clear that the cloudy covering was also present in the mighty symbol of the divine presence. But that the fire was not absent by day, that it was only concealed by the cloudy veil, appears from two other passages, Ex. xvi. 10, and Num. xvi. 19, 35, where, on an extraordinary occasion, in order to make the presence of God felt by the Israelites, the fire, which was generally concealed by day and obscured by the sunshine, broke forth into full splendour. The pillar of cloud and of fire occupied the front of the Israelitish camp in their marches (for during the encampment it rested upon the tabernacle of the covenant); Israel, the army of God, preceded by God their general: comp. Ex. xiii. 21, xxiii. 23; Deut. i. 33. It showed the Israelites the direction they should take: if it moved, the people broke up their camp; if it rested, they encamped. By night it gave them light; by day, when it was more extended, it gave them protection against the heat; as it is said in Ps. cv. 39, "He spread a cloud for a covering, and fire to give light in the night." Comp. Num. x. 34, "And the cloud of the Lord was upon them by day, when they went out of the camp;" Isa. iv. 5, 6, xxv. 5, where the shadow of the cloud, which at one time protected Israel, is made a symbol of God's protection in the heat of trouble and temptation. From

it all the divine commands proceeded, Num. xii. 5; Ex. xxix. 42, 43. Destruction went forth from it upon the enemies of the people of God, as we learn from the example of the Egyptians. It frequently bears the name כבוד יהוה, the glory of Jehovah, that by which God revealed His glory. It was in a lower sense what Christ was in the fullest sense: τὸ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ. If what is related of the pillar of cloud and of fire be truth, it must prove itself as such by the fact that only the form of the thing is peculiar to the Old Testament, while its essence is common to all times. The whole must have a symbolical, prophetic character. The whole thing is treated as a prophecy. In the Messianic time God will again provide His people with a cloud by day and the splendour of flaming fire by night. Here we have a striking image of the most special providence of God in Christ, on behalf of His Church; we see how He leads His people in their wanderings through the wilderness of the world, guides and defends them, and avenges them on their enemies; how He shows them the way to the heavenly Canaan; how He protects them against the heat of misfortune and temptation; how He illumines them in the darkness of sin, error, and of misery; but also how He reveals Himself to them as consuming fire, by punishing them for their sins, and rooting out sinners from their midst. We have still to examine why this form was chosen as the symbol of the divine presence. The prevalent opinion regards the cloud only as a veil. According to 1 Tim. the concealed God dwells in *φῶς ἀπρόσιτον*. Even the revealed God must veil His majesty, because no mortal eye can bear the sight. But the clouds with which, or attended by which, the Lord comes, imply in all other places in Scripture the administration of judgment. Comp. Isa. xix. 1; Ps. xviii. 10, xcvii. 2; Nah. i. 3; Apoc. i. 7. And the correspondence of the fire by night with the cloud by day, comp. Num. ix. 15, 16, proves that the cloud in the pillar of cloud and of fire bears a like threatening character. Destruction descends from the cloud upon the Egyptians, Ex. xiv. 24. In the pillar of cloud the Lord came down to judge Miriam and Aaron, Num. xii. 5. Isa. iv. 5, 6, distinguishes a twofold element in the fire—the shining and the burning—and both appear separately in the history. At the same time fire breaks

forth from the cloud for the destruction of Egypt, and light shines out upon Israel. In Scripture, light is the symbol of divine grace, fire the energy of God's punitive justice, by which He glorifies Himself within and without the Church in those who would not glorify Him. That the fire in the cloud is not to be regarded as bringing blessing but destruction, is shown not only from the example of the Egyptians, but also from Ex. xxiv. 17, "And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire." Moses, Dent. iv. 24, characterizes God Himself as a consuming fire, with reference to this symbol, comp. Isa. xxxiii. 14, 15, Heb. xii. 29 (and what we previously said of the symbol of the burning bush). The fire, therefore, attested to Israel the same thing which was conveyed in the verbal utterance of God concerning His angel, Ex. xxiii. 21, "Beware of Him, and obey His voice, provoke Him not; for He will not pardon your transgressions." From this it appears that in many cases the fire breaks forth with startling splendour as the reflection of the punitive divine justice, to terrify the refractory in the camp: comp. Ex. xvi. 10; Num. xiv. 10, xvi. 19, xvii. 7 *et seq.* The Angel of the Lord is a reviving sun to the just; to the ungodly consuming fire. The symbol proclaimed this truth; and the history of the march through the wilderness confirmed it. But the fire, like the cloud, bears a twofold character. The threat also includes a promise. If Israel be Israel, it is directed against their enemies, while to them it is the fortress of salvation: comp. Num. ix. 15 *et seq.* The God of energetic judgment is their God. If Israel were the people of God, then the pillar of cloud and of fire became a warning to all their enemies. "Touch not mine anointed, and do my people no harm." Rationalism has mooted the hypothesis, that the pillar of cloud and fire was nothing more than the fire which is frequently carried before the marches of caravans in iron vessels on poles, that it may give light by night, while the smoke forms a signal by day. The origination of this fancy plainly shows how every one who has not himself experienced God's special providence, is under the necessity of obliterating all traces of it from history. It is impossible for him who has the substance to stumble at the form, adapted as it was to the wants which the people of God then had. Ex. xiv. 24 serves as a refutation of this

view, so far as it claims to be in harmony with the narrative itself ; for according to this passage, lightning came down from the pillar of cloud upon the Egyptians : comp. also the passages just cited, where the obstinate are terrified by the sudden breaking out of fire. He who stands in the faith will draw comfort and edification from this circumstance, instead of abandoning himself to such miserable interpretations ; and is thus enabled the more easily to recognise the Angel of God who goes before him also. From the stand-point of faith we must necessarily agree with Vitringa, who says : “*Ecquis vero, qui divinae majestatis reverentia et termitatis humanae sensu affectus est, ut decet, non stupeat, Deum immortalem et gloriosum homines mortales tam singulari prosecutum esse elementia et gratia, ut suam iis praesentiam notabili adeo et illustri symbolo demonstrare voluerit?*” This sign of the divine presence, this guarantee that God was in their midst, was the more necessary for the people of God since their leader Moses was a mere man, whose divine commission made it the more desirable that there should be a confirmation of the divine presence by means of an independent sign. It is quite different with respect to the church of the new covenant, whose head is the God-man. The accounts of the caravan-fire (best given in the *Description*, t. 8, p. 128) are of interest only in so far as this custom appears to be the foundation upon which the form of the symbol of the divine presence was based. The pillar of cloud and fire may be characterized as an irony of that caravan-fire. The hypothesis of Ewald, which makes the pillar of cloud and fire to have been the holy altar-fire, is perhaps still more unfortunate. His partiality for this hypothesis leads him to assume, in direct opposition to the narrative, that the pillar of cloud and fire first appeared at the erection of the holy tabernacle, and forcibly to explain away all those passages in which the pillar of cloud and fire afterwards appears outside the sanctuary ; all this only in the interest of ordinary miracle-explanation, which, with him, generally plays an important part, though it does not venture to come forth openly. Above all it must not be forgotten that our source describes the pillar of cloud as it was seen with the eye of faith. It was no doubt so arranged here, as it is everywhere, that obstinate unbelief should have a handle—some apparent justification of the natural explanation of the pheno-

menon. We must not form too material a conception of the pillar of cloud; we must not regard it as having remained absolutely the same at all times, nor as distinctly separated from all natural phenomena. So palpable an appearance of the divine continuing for so long a period would be without analogy; and nothing in the narrative obliges us to accept it if we remember that the author's object was not to give an accurate and detailed description of the phenomenon in all its phases and changes, for scientific purposes, but that, as a writer of sacred history, he was only concerned with its significance for the piety to which it belonged.

The reason why Moses, at God's command, did not take the Israelites by the nearest way to Canaan, through the land of the Philistines, but led them by the path through the Arabian desert, is given in Deut. xiii. 17: "Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt." But, in order to understand the full significance of this reason, it is necessary to bring back the particular to its universal foundation. It was the lack of living, heartfelt, stedfast faith which made them incapable of fighting with the Philistines. Owing to this weakness they could not yet perform what was required of them in Deut. xx. 1: "When thou goest out to battle against thine enemies, and seest horses and chariots, and a people more than thou, be not afraid of them: for the Lord thy God is with thee, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." And the same lack of faith made it necessary that in many other respects also they should be first sent into the wilderness, the preparatory school. As the people of God, they were destined to possess the land of Canaan. Therefore, before the possession of it could be granted to them, they must become the people of God in spirit. In this respect they had only yet made a weak beginning. It was, therefore, impossible that they should at once be led to Canaan, the more so because divine decorum required that the ministers of divine punitive justice to the Canaanites should not themselves deserve the same punishment. The bestowal of the land on a people not much less sinful than the Canaanites, would have been an actual contradiction of the declaration that it was taken from them on account of their sins. For the covenant-people there were no purely external gifts. The exhortation was, "Seek ye

first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." The kernel and foundation of all this was the land of Canaan. How then could it be given to Israel before they had earnestly sought after the kingdom of God? It would have been severity in God to have given it to them immediately after their departure out of Egypt. For the land would soon have cast out the new inhabitants, just as it did the former, comp. Lev. xviii. 28. It has been objected that the new generation showed itself still sinful in the fortieth year. But a perfectly holy people does not belong to this troubled world. The history of the time of Joshua, however, sufficiently shows that the new generation was animated by a very different spirit from that which had grown up under Egyptian influence.

The passage through the Red Sea is to be regarded in a twofold aspect as the necessary conclusion of the Egyptian plagues. First, with respect to Israel. If they had departed triumphantly out of Egypt without any hindrance, with a high hand, as the text has it—*i.e.*, frank and free—then the plagues would soon have been forgotten because of the slight point of contact which the wonderful divine manifestations still had with their minds. How much their confidence had increased, appears from the fact that they came forth from Egypt in order, in the form of an army; or, according to the source, they went out חֲמִשָּׁה—*i.e.*, in the opinion of Ewald, in fives, separated into middle, right and left wing, front and back lines, in accordance with the simplest division of every army which is prepared for battle. But according to others, the expression means equipped in warlike trim. The human heart is refractory and desponding. When things turn out evil, despair at once sets in; when all is prosperous, false confidence and pride arise. Though previously without arms, they wished to play the soldier, and thought themselves able to overcome the world; they formed themselves into ranks as well as they could; and doubtless made a ridiculous spectacle to those among the Egyptian spectators who were skilled in war. It was time that their own weakness should be brought powerfully home to them; which happened when God put it into Pharaoh's heart to pursue them. In order that the earlier distress and help might attain their object, the distress and help must rise once more at the exodus to the

highest point; death without God, and life through God, must once again be placed in the liveliest contrast. Again, with respect to Pharaoh. The divine judgment had advanced only to the death of his first-born son. The water did not yet reach his neck. If we take into consideration the greatness of his obduracy, we see that there was still one prophecy unfulfilled—that of his death. Without this, the revelation of the divine righteousness, the type of the judgment on the world and its princes, at once strikes us as incomplete,—a mere fragment which, as such, does not carry with it the internal certainty of divine authorship.

The deep significance of the passage through the sea as an actual prophecy is already recognised by the prophets, when they represent the deliverance by the Messiah and the final victory of God's people over the world as a repetition of this event, for example, Isa. xi. 15, 16. It has also been recognised by our pious singers when they make it a pledge of God's continual guidance through sorrow to joy, through the cross to glory; comp. the song, "Um frisch hinein, es wird so tief nicht sein, das rothe Meer wird dir schon Platz vergönnen," etc., after the example of the Psalmist in numerous passages, Ps. cxiv. 3, etc., where the sea is specially regarded as the symbol of the power of the world, and its retreating before the children of Israel as the pledge of the victory of God's people over the world.

We have still to consider the relation of the passage through the Red Sea to that through the Jordan. Both are closely connected. First as a justification of Israel against the Canaanites. This aspect is already brought forward in the song of praise in Ex. xv. 15: "Sorrow shall take hold on the inhabitants of Palestine. Then the dukes of Edom shall be amazed; the mighty men of Moab, trembling shall take hold upon them; all the inhabitants of Canaan shall melt away." As the servants of divine righteousness, the Israelites were to exterminate the Canaanites. Such a commission is not at all conceivable unless he to whom it is given receives an unquestionably divine authorization. Otherwise the greatest scope is given to human wickedness. Each one might invent such a commission, by which means that which was really divine punishment might not be recognised as such. But because

the Israelites were led out from their former habitation in a marvellous way, and in a marvellous way conducted into their new habitation, it was impossible that any one should throw doubt on their divine commission. The passage through the Red Sea was to the Canaanites an actual proclamation of divine judgment. It showed them that it was not the sword of Israel, but of God, that was suspended over their heads. And because they saw it in this light their courage failed them. The passage through the Jordan could no longer come unexpected. It was already implied in the passage through the Red Sea, as its necessary complement, and must follow, if we suppose that the Jordan by its natural power placed an insuperable obstacle in the way of entrance into the promised land. For to what purpose had the Lord led the people out of Egypt? Certainly with no other object than to lead them into the land of promise. Finally, both events are closely connected in a typical aspect also. He whom God leads forth from the bondage of the world with a strong hand, has in this a pledge that God will also lead him with a strong hand into the heavenly Canaan.

With respect to the mode and manner of the deliverance from Egypt, when the Israelites had once come as far as the region north of the Arabian Gulf, and therefore to the borders of Egypt, they would in all human probability have left Egypt at once, and have taken the eastern side of the Arabian Gulf. But instead of this Moses led them, at the divine command, back again, up the western side of the Arabian Gulf. If they were attacked here, they were cut off from all escape, supposing that before the attack the region north of the Red Sea was occupied, in which case there might already be an Egyptian castle here for the protection of the country against the hordes of the wilderness. Pharaoh, who had ascertained their position by means of spies, rushed into the snare that God had laid for him. If the former divine manifestations had found any response in him, his first thought would have been that this was a snare, like God's former dealing in permitting the success of his magicians. But human judgment is swayed by inclination—a mighty proof that a just God, who takes the wise in their craftiness, has dominion over the world—and with Pharaoh inclination was always predominant. Thus he saw what he

wished to see. The position of the Israelites, humanly speaking so unwisely chosen, appeared to furnish him with a certain proof that they could not be under the special guidance of divine providence, that there was no God of Israel who was at the same time God over the whole world, and that the clear proof of His existence, which he had hitherto experienced, had been only delusion and accident. The more he reproached himself with foolishness, in having yielded to them, the more he hastened to wipe out the disgrace. This was his only object; he lost sight of everything else. Here we see plainly how God befools the sinner. The operation of God forms the only key to the explanation of Pharaoh's incomprehensible delusion; an operation which, however, was not confined to him alone, but appears daily. Without it there would be no criminal. But the conduct of the Israelites when they saw the danger before their eyes, their utter despair, as if they had never been in contact with God, is equally incomprehensible for him who is ignorant of human nature and the heart of man in its stubbornness and despondency. For him who looks deeper, all this impresses the description with the seal of truth.

The place of crossing was in all probability the extreme northern limit of the gulf (Niebuhr's *Description of Arabia*, p. 410), where, according to Niebuhr's measurement, it is 757 double steps broad, and was therefore a fitting scene for the manifestation of divine miraculous power. V. Schubert, in his *Travels in the East*, part ii. p. 269, estimates the breadth of the Isthmus of Suez at about half an hour. There are also facts which show that the Isthmus of Suez formerly extended farther towards the north, and was broader: comp. Niebuhr, in the passages already cited, Robinson's *Palestine*, i. 19, and Fr. Strauss, *Journey to the East*, p. 120. V. Raumer, in the *March of the Israelites from Egypt to Canaan*, Leipzig 1837, p. 9 *sqq.*, represents the Israelites as having gone much farther south across the gulf, by the plain Bede, where the sea is perhaps six hours' journey across; but this view is sufficiently disproved by the circumstance that he proceeds on an erroneous determination of the place from which the Israelites set out, and of the way they took, making this determination the only basis of his assumption: comp. the copious refutation in *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, p. 54 *sqq.* If it be established

that the place from which the Israelites set out, Raamses, is identical with Heroöpolis, and that Heroöpolis lay north-east of the Arabian Gulf, in the vicinity of the Bitter Lakes, thirteen French hours from the Arabian Gulf, which the Israelites reached on the second day after their departure, then it is proved at the same time that the passage must have taken place not far from the extreme north. V. Raumer, who places Raamses in the neighbourhood of Heliopolis, asserts that from here to the Red Sea was a journey of twenty-six hours, which it was not possible for the Israelites to accomplish in two days. In his later work, *Aids to Biblical Geography*, Leipzig 1843, p. 1 *sqq.*, and also in the third and fourth edition of *The Geography of Palestine*, v. Raumer himself destroys the foundation of his hypothesis, which, however, he still retains, by agreeing with the position assigned to Raamses in *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, afterward independently maintained by Robinson. The argument, that the way is too long for two days' journey, he meets with the assumption that Ex. xiii. 20 and Num. xxxiii. 6 refer only to the places of encampment where the Israelites remained for a longer period. But this distinction between days of journeying and places of encampment is highly improbable, so far as the march of the Israelites through Egyptian territory is concerned; for Pharaoh drove them out of the land in haste, Ex. xii. 33, and their own interest demanded that they should depart with the greatest possible speed. The assertion, "It is quite incomprehensible why the Israelites should have despaired, or why a miracle should have happened, if they could have gone round that little tongue of water without any inconvenience," does not take into consideration what is said in *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, p. 58, founded on Ex. xiv. 2, in favour of the assumption that the Egyptian garrison had blocked up the way by the north of the gulf. Here it was quite immaterial whether the Israelites went more or less south. But the view that the Israelites travelled by Bede through the sea entails great difficulties, for the passage of such immense masses could scarcely have been effected in so short a time through a sea three miles in width. Stichel, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1850, ii. S. 377 ff., whom Kurtz, *Geschichte des A. B.* ii. S. 166 ff., has incautiously followed, contests the identity of Raamses and Heroöpolis. But the objection that, in accord-

ance with the narrative, Raamses must have lain close to the Egyptian residence, confounds the temporary dwelling-place of Pharaoh, who had repaired to the scene of events, with his usual residence. The assertion of Stichel, that Raamses is identical with Belbeis must be regarded as purely visionary; while the identity with Heroöpolis has important authorities in its favour, especially the testimony of the LXX., which Stichel vainly tries to set aside. But there are decided positive reasons against the identity with Belbeis. In its interest Stichel, like v. Raumer, is obliged to assume a succession of days' journeyings. And he himself is obliged to confess that this hypothesis is incompatible with the fact attested in Ps. lxxviii. 12, 43, comp. with Num. xiii. 22 (23), that Zoan or Zanis was at that time the residence of Pharaoh. The following was the course of the catastrophe:—An east wind drove the water some distance on to the Egyptian shore, where it was absorbed by the thirsty sand, and at the same time kept back the water of the southern part of the sea, preventing it from occupying the space thus vacated, which was surrounded by water on both sides, north and south. Here again a handle was given to the unbelief of the Egyptians. In the natural means employed by God, they overlooked the work of His miraculous power. The darkness also in which they were enveloped by the cloud they regarded as merely accidental. It has been frequently maintained that the passage of the Israelites took place at the time of the ebb, while the flow engulfed the Egyptians who pursued them. This hypothesis is refuted by the fact that קרים never means or can mean the east wind; and, moreover, it is inconsistent with the oft-repeated statement that the water stood up to right and left of the Israelites, as also with the analogy of the passage through the Jordan. Besides, the Egyptians, knowing the nature of their own country, would certainly not have followed so blindly if a tide were to be expected. We must therefore give up this hypothesis, which has been recently revived by Robinson and justly opposed by v. Raumer. Moreover, the efficacy here attributed to the wind still finds its analogies: "When a continuous north wind," says Schubert, "drives the water towards the south, especially at the time of ebb, it can be traversed northwards from Suez, and may be waded through on foot; but if the wind suddenly turns round to the south-east,

the water may rise in a short time to the height of six feet. Napoleon experienced this when he wanted to ride through the sea at that place, and was in danger of his life owing to the sudden rise of the water. When he had been safely brought back to land, he said, 'It would have made an interesting text for every preacher in Europe if I had been drowned here.'" But God's time had not yet come—he was still needed; afterwards he was swallowed up in Moscow.

§ 4.

THE MARCH THROUGH THE WILDERNESS UNTIL THE GIVING OF THE LAW ON SINAI.

The result of the former leadings of God is thus given in Ex. xiv. 31 : "And Israel saw that great work which the Lord did upon the Egyptians: and the people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord and His servant Moses." The song in Ex. xv. is an expression of fear and of faith, with the love arising therefrom. The same love is also attributed to the people in Jer. ii. 2, "I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals, when thou wentest after me in the wilderness, in a land that was not sown," which must be regarded as having reference to the first time of the sojourn in the wilderness before the giving of the law on Sinai, on account of the mention of the youth and espousals which are replaced by marriage on Sinai. The whole behaviour of the people at the giving of the law also bears testimony to this love, the extreme readiness with which they promise to do everything the Lord may command. Then again, the great zeal in presenting the best they had for the construction of the sacred tabernacle.

It seems at the first glance that the people might now have been put in possession of the inheritance promised to them by the Lord; and so they themselves believed, as we see from their murmuring on every opportunity. But because God knew the disposition of human nature, He chose a different course. The state of almost entire estrangement from God was succeeded by one of temptation and trial, the necessity of which rests on the

circumstance that the influence of Egypt was not limited to the surface, but had penetrated to the lowest depths.

It is expressly stated in Deut. viii. 2-5, the principal passage bearing on the subject, that temptation and trial formed the centre of the entire guidance through the wilderness: "And thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, to know what was in thine heart, whether thou wouldest keep His commandments, or no." The same thing appears also from the comparison of Christ's sojourn in the wilderness; for its essential agreement with the guidance of Israel is indicated by the external similarity of time and place—the wilderness, and the forty years corresponding to the forty days. It is shown also by the history itself, which only comes out in its true light when we start from the idea of trial. And finally it is made manifest by the predictions of the prophets, who announce the repetition of the three stations—Egypt, the wilderness, and Canaan: Hos. ii. 16; Ex. xx. 34-38; Jer. xxxi. 1, 2. The first is complete bondage to the world, first as guilt and then as punishment; the second is trial and purification; the third is the induction into full possession of divine grace.

But what is the nature of temptation? It presupposes that there is already something in man, that the fire of love to God is already kindled in him, and is the means which God's love employs to strengthen and purify this love. First love is only too often, indeed always more or less, but a straw-fire. Sin is not quite mortified; it is only momentarily overpowered. The true rooting out of sin, the changing of the love of feeling and of phantasy into a heartfelt, profound, moral love, demands that sin should be brought to the light, that the inner nature of man should be perfectly revealed, that all self-deception, all unconscious hypocrisy should be made bare. True self-knowledge is the basis of true God-knowledge. From it springs self-hatred, the condition of love to God. We learn to know our own weakness, and are by this means brought closer to God. So also in temptation we learn to know God in the continuous help which He vouchsafes to us, in the long-suffering and patience that He has with our weakness, in the expression of His punitive justice towards our obduracy; and

this knowledge of God forms the basis of heartfelt love to Him.

God proves in a double way—by taking and by giving. By taking. As long as we are in the lap of fortune, we readily imagine that we love God above everything, and stand in the most intimate fellowship with Him. While adhering to the gifts, the heart believes that it is adhering to God. God takes away the gifts, and the self-deception becomes manifest. If it now appear that we do not love God without His gifts, at the same time it becomes clear that we did not formerly love Him in His gifts. Again, in happiness we readily imagine that we possess a heroic faith. We say triumphantly, "Who shall separate us from the love of God?" But as soon as misfortune comes, we look upon ourselves as hopelessly lost. We place no confidence in God; we doubt and murmur. It is impossible to determine the character of our faith until we are tried by the cross.

But just as Satan seeks to make pleasure as well as pain instrumental to our ruin, so God tries by that which He gives no less than by that which He takes. We are only too ready to forget the Giver in His gifts, we become accustomed to them, they appear to us as something quite natural; gratitude disappears, we ask "Why this alone? why not that also?" The heart which is moved to despair by the taking becomes insolent on the giving. God allows us to have His gifts in order to bring to light this disposition of the heart.

The second station is, for many, the last. Many fall in the wilderness. But while a mass of individuals are left lying there, the church of God always advances to the third station—to the possession of Canaan. The state of purification is for them always a state of sifting. Ezekiel says, chap. xx. 38, "And I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel: and ye shall know that I am the Lord." In Ezekiel this appears as a promise. That which is a misfortune to individuals is a benefit to the church. The rooting out of obdurate sinners by trial is for the church what the rooting out of sin is for the individual.

Let us now investigate somewhat more closely the locality

of the temptation. Much light has been thrown on this subject by recent travellers, especially Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria and the Holy Land*, London 1822, in German by W. Gesenius, Weimar 1823; Ruffell, *Reisen in Nubien, Kordofan, und dem Peträischen Arabien*, Frankfurt 1838-40; Laborde, *Voyage de l'Arabie Pétrée*, Paris 1830-34; Robinson, who does not, however, afford so much information here as on Canaan. The best summary is contained in the map of v. Raumer: *Der Zug der Israeliten aus Aegypten nach Canaan*, Leipzig 1837; comp. his *Beiträge zur biblischen Geographie*, Leipzig 1843, and the latest edition of the *Geographie von Palästina*, 1860. Then Ritter's *Erdkunde*, 14ter Theil, *die Sinai-Halbinsel*, Berlin 1848. Close to the fruitful country on the eastern side of the Lower Nile, at a short distance from Cairo, the barren desert of Arabia begins, and extends from thence to the bank of the Euphrates. The Edomite mountains, extending from the Aelanitic Gulf to the Dead Sea, divide this desert into the Eastern Arabia Deserta and the Western Arabia Petraea. The latter is bounded on the north by the Mediterranean Sea and Palestine, on the south it runs out into a point between the Gulf of Suez and of Aila; and on the end of this point is Mount Sinai, in the language of Scripture, Horeb. This mountain has springs, luxuriant vegetation, and noble fruits, but north of it the country at once assumes a dreary aspect. First comes a barren and waterless plain of sand, then the mountain-chain et-Tih, and beyond it the dreadful desert et-Tih, occupying the greater part of the peninsula. Here bare chalk hills alternate with plains of dazzling white, drifting sand, extending farther than the eye can reach; there are a few springs, mostly bitter—not a tree, not a shrub, not a human dwelling. On the wide stretch from Sinai to Gaza there is not a single village.

Towards the east this waste table-land et-Tih sinks down into a valley fifty hours' journey in length and two hours' journey wide, which extends from the southern point of the Dead Sea to the Aelanitic Gulf; the northern half is now el-Ghor, the southern, el-Araba. In Scripture the name Araba is employed of the entire district. On the whole it is waste, yet not without a few oases. In this valley the Israelites had their principal camp during the thirty-eight years of exile.

The Edomite range, which forms the eastern boundary, rises

abruptly from the bottom of the valley, but on the other side it is only slightly elevated above the higher desert of Arabia Deserta.

The country, where for forty years the Israelites were kept in the school of temptation, was in two respects better adapted to their object than any other; and in this choice we see clearly the divine wisdom. 1. The land was a true picture of the state of the Israelites, and was therefore calculated to bring it to their consciousness. That this formed part of the divine plan is shown by the analogous sojourn of John in the wilderness. Although already in Canaan in the body—this is the virtual testimony of John—yet the nation is essentially still in the wilderness. They do not yet possess God in the fulness of His blessings and gifts. They are still in the barren wilderness, in the state of trial, sifting, and purification. But now the entrance into Canaan is at hand. Happy is he who does not remain lying in the wilderness. 2. The Arabian desert was by its natural character peculiarly adapted to serve as the place of trial for a whole nation. Where natural means are in existence, God, who is also the originator of the natural world, makes them subservient to His purpose, and does not by miracles interfere with a nature, independent, and existing beside Him. In the trial by *taking* there was no necessity for any extraordinary exercise of power. The barren and waste desert gave opportunity enough. It also presented a natural substratum for the trial by *giving*, though less than might have been found elsewhere. This very circumstance, however, was specially adapted to God's plan. By this means He manifested Himself the more clearly as the giver. He who tries no man beyond what he is able to bear, would not expect a nation still weak to recognise Him as the giver of those gifts which came to them in the ordinary course of nature. He gave them bread from heaven to teach them that the common bread also came from heaven. This mode of thought characterizes the lawgiver himself. In Deut. viii. 3 we read, "He suffered them to hunger, and fed them with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that He might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live." Ewald says, "The desert is like the sea, exactly adapted, as it

were, to remind man in the strongest way of his natural helplessness and frailty, teaching him at the same time to place a truer and higher value on those strange alleviations and deliverances which he often encounters so unexpectedly, even in the wilderness."

The beginning of the temptation occurred at the bitter waters of Mara. "The water," says Burckhardt, "is so bitter that men cannot drink it, and even camels, unless very thirsty, cannot endure it." This was the more felt by the Israelites, because they were accustomed to the excellent water of the Nile, highly lauded by all travellers. God might previously have deprived the water of its bitterness, but in this case Israel would neither have murmured nor have expressed gratitude; and the design was that they should do both, as long as they still retained their morbid temper of mind. The bitterness of their heart was to be revealed by the bitterness of the water. So also in its sweetness they were to become sensible of the sweet love of God towards them. The antithesis to the wood by which the water is here made sweet, is to be found in the Apocalypse, viii. 10, 11, in the wormwood which is thrown by God into the water of the world and makes it bitter. For His own, God makes the bitter water sweet; for the world, He makes the sweet water bitter. How far the means by which the water was made sweet were natural, and to be looked upon as a gift of God only as they pointed out that which had hitherto been unknown, we cannot determine. The present inhabitants, from whom Burckhardt and Robinson made inquiries, are not acquainted with any means of sweetening the waters, which still continue bitter; and the accurate researches of Lepsius led to just as little result. After God had helped the people by Moses, and had put their murmuring to shame, He gave them "a statute and an ordinance," Ex. xv. 25,—that is to say, He brought home to their hearts the truths which had been brought to light by these events, the condemnation attached to unbelief, and the unfailing certainty of divine help if they only walked in the way of God. Ver. 26 shows that the words are to be understood in this sense. The history will only gain its proper educating effect when it is rightly interpreted and applied by the ministers of the word.

As the first temptation had reference to drink, the second

was connected with food. This was natural. The carnal people who had taken such pleasure in the flesh-pots of Egypt must be attacked on their sensitive side. They could not yet be tempted by spiritual drought and spiritual hunger. God first allows their unbelief to appear in a very gross form, and then shames them by miraculous help, which is again a temptation.

The Israelites had longed not only for Egyptian bread, but also for Egyptian meat. God showed that He was able to give them both, by granting them manna and quails on one and the same day; the latter merely as a token of His power. For the present, manna only was to be the permanent food of the people, lest by the too great abundance of the gifts they should be led to despise them. The quails disappeared after having served as their food for only one day, to be given to them afterwards, however, for a longer period.

It is well known that there is a natural manna in the Arabian desert. But this does not exclude the fact that in this manna the Israelites recognised the glory of the Lord, to use a scriptural expression, and were able to call it *מן*—present, gift of God; a name which afterwards passed over to the natural manna. For them it was bread from heaven. In Ex. xvi. 4 it is called “bread of the mighty ones,” and in Ps. lxxviii. 25, bread of the angels, *i.e.* bread from the region of the angels, or, as the Chaldee paraphrases it, “food which came down from the dwelling of the angels.” To make use of this natural manna to do away with the miracle, is nothing less than to throw suspicion on the miraculous feeding of the 5000, because of the fewness of the loaves and fishes which formed the natural substratum of it. According to Burckhardt, the quantity of manna now collected on the peninsula, even in the most rainy years, amounts only to 500 to 600 pounds. We must, therefore, ask with the apostles, *ταῦτα τί εἰς τοσούτους*; In years which are not rainy scarcely any is to be found. But, on the other hand, we must take care not to follow the course recently pursued by v. Raumer and Kurtz, respecting the manna, who, in their fear of the worship of miracles, go beyond the statements of Scripture. We must enter somewhat more fully into these misunderstandings (with reference to the discussions in our work on Balaam). (1.) It has been often assumed, owing to a

misunderstanding of Josh. v. 11, 12, that manna was given to the Israelites, not only on the Sinaitic peninsula, but also in the trans-Jordanic country, and even during the first period of their residence in Canaan proper. But it is clear that the passage refers to a definite cessation, from the circumstance that the period of manna now definitively ceases, and is replaced by the period of bread. That it must be so understood follows from Josh. i. 11, and still more decisively from Ex. xvi. 35, where the inhabited land appears as the natural limit of the manna, which is spoken of as something already past. In Deut. viii. 2, 3, 16, the manna and the wilderness appear inseparably connected. It is thus certain that the manna did not follow the Israelites into Canaan. It even appears probable, from Deut. ii. 6, that manna was not given to them beyond its usual district, the Sinaitic peninsula. (2.) In accordance with the prevailing opinion, manna formed the sole food of the Israelites during the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, coming to them without any interruption, and always in the same abundance. But we are led to a contrary result, first, by the statements of the Pentateuch itself, from which it appears that the desert was the abode of many peoples, who found their sustenance in it, and further, by a consideration of the natural resources offered by the wilderness, which are expressly mentioned in Ex. xv. 27. And we know from Deut. ii. 6, 7, that they possessed pecuniary means which enabled them to procure by trade all that was necessary, as soon as they came into the neighbourhood of inhabited districts. The accounts of recent travellers, moreover, confirm the statements of the Israelites themselves, that the Arabian desert is rich in resources; and there are many indications that these resources were at one time considerably more abundant. Such indications are collected in my essay, *Moses and Colenso*, in the year 64 of the *Evangelical Kirchenzeitung*, which enters minutely into the means of subsistence afforded to the Israelites in the wilderness. Notwithstanding all this, however, there must unquestionably have been times and places in which the maintenance of so large a multitude necessarily demanded extraordinary divine assistance, and at such times and in such places the Israelites received the gift of manna.

We only remark further, that Ehrenberg's assumption, that

natural manna is the honey-like secretion of a small insect, is now almost universally rejected. Wellsted, Lepsius, and Ritter, who have given us the most complete account of the manna, have declared against it. The opinion that the natural manna exudes from a twig of the manna-tamarisk is also subject to considerable suspicion. From the analogy of the biblical manna, which "the Lord rained from heaven," according to Ex. xvi. 4, and which "fell upon the camp in the night with the dew," according to Num. xi. 9, it seems more probable that the manna-tamarisk merely exercises an attractive influence upon the manna which comes out of the air, and that this latter is not absolutely connected with it. But we cannot follow those who do away with this connection between the natural and the biblical manna. We are led to uphold it from the circumstance that manna is not found in any part of the earth, except where it was given to the Israelites, and that the natural manna is found in the very place where the Israelites first received it, and finally from the identity of name. This connection is already recognised by Josephus. He relates that in his time, by the grace of God, there was a continuance of the same food which rained down in the time of Moses. The differences—among which the most important is that the present manna contains no proper element of nutrition, but, according to Mitscherlich's chemical analysis, consists of mere sweet gum—prove nothing against the connection, since the same natural phenomenon may appear in various modifications.

The giving of the manna—which served as a continual reminder to the nation that the milk and honey so abundant in the promised land were also the gift of God, a remembrance which was kept alive by the enjoined laying up of a pot with manna before the ark of the covenant in the Holy of holies—was also highly important in another aspect. It formed a preparation for the introduction of the Sabbath, which had hitherto not been generally observed among the Israelites. The gathering of a double portion on Friday, mentioned in Ex. xvi. 22-30, and the gathering of none on the Sabbath, were not a result of caprice on the part of the people, as the defenders of the pre-Mosaic observance of the Sabbath have falsely assumed. The people gathered on each occasion as much manna as had fallen; and by the decree of God this

sufficed for their wants. On Friday there was unexpectedly so much, that double the usual portion could be gathered. Amazed, the elders of the people hasten to Moses and ask him what is to be done with this superabundance. He tells them that it must serve for the following day also, on which, as the day holy to the Lord, no manna would fall. Taken in this sense, the event stands in remarkable parallel with another : the command to eat unleavened bread was not given to the people at the first passover, but, contrary to expectation, God so disposed events that they were obliged to eat unleavened bread against their will. This divine institution served as a sanction to the Mosaic arrangement for the later celebration of the feast. In a similar way God hallowed the Sabbath before allowing the command to hallow it to reach the nation through Moses. He took from them the possibility of work on the Sabbath, to show them that in future they must abstain from it voluntarily. At the same time He made them understand that it was not designed to injure their bodily health. By the circumstance that a double portion was given on Friday, and that those who were disobedient to the word of God and went out on the Sabbath to collect manna, found nothing, it was made evident that God's blessing on the six days of acquisition may suffice for the seventh ; and that he is left destitute who selfishly and greedily tries to snatch from God the seventh day also, and to use it for his own ends. The Lord, it is said, gives you the Sabbath. Here the Sabbath already appears not as a burden but as a pleasure, Isa. lviii. 13, as a precious privilege which God gives to His people. To be able to rest without anxiety,—to rest to the Lord and in the Lord,—what a consolation in our toil and travail on the earth which the Lord has cursed ! But just because the day of rest is a love-gift of the merciful God, contempt of it is the more heavily avenged. We cannot assume that with this event the Sabbath received its full meaning among Israel. It certainly implies the observance of the Sabbath, but in this connection only with reference to the gathering and preparation of the manna. The injunction of a comprehensive observance of the Sabbath first went forth on Mount Sinai. The Sabbath could only unfold its benignant power in connection with a series of divine ordinances. It is significant only as a link in a chain. But, since the Sabbath

is here actually hallowed, it is the proper place to speak of its design and significance, to which so much importance is attributed in the Old Testament economy. The whole idea of the Sabbath is expressed in the Mosaic "God hallowed the Sabbath," and "Remember the Sabbath, to keep it holy." From this it is plain that the observance of the Sabbath did not consist in idle rest, which is proved also by the fact that not only was a special sacrifice presented on the Sabbath, comp. Num. xxviii. 9, 10, but also a holy assembly was held, Lev. xxiii. 3; a fact which has been quite overlooked by Bähr, who makes the observance to consist in mere rest. Let us enter somewhat more fully into this passage. Jewish scholars, beginning with Josephus and Philo, have justly regarded this verse as the first origin of synagogues. In the wilderness, the national sanctuary was the natural place for holy assemblies on the Sabbath. After the occupation of the land, assemblies for divine worship were formed in different places on the authority of this passage alone. From 2 Kings iv. 23 we learn that on the Sabbaths those who were piously disposed among the twelve tribes gathered round the prophets. In the central divine worship the sacrifices to be presented on the Sabbath formed the nucleus for these sacred assemblies. The natural accompaniment of sacrifice is prayer, by which it is interpreted and inspired. Even in patriarchal times invocation of the Lord went hand in hand with sacrifice; and we are led to the conclusion that sacred song was also associated with it, from the fact that among the Psalms we find one (Ps. xcii.) which, according to its superscription and contents, was specially designed for the Sabbath-day. And the reading of the law must unquestionably have formed part of the service, if we judge from the significance attributed to it in the law itself; which could not fail to be soon followed by exposition and application. Only the presentation of sacrifice, however, was limited to the national sanctuary; no such limits were set to other acts of worship. So much for Lev. xxiii. 3. We now return to the exposition of those Mosaic passages which treat of the hallowing of the Sabbath. In accordance with the prevailing idea attached to hallowing, to hallow the seventh day can only mean "to consecrate it to God in every respect." That day alone can be truly consecrated to the holy God on which we con-

secrete ourselves to Him, withdraw ourselves completely from the world, with its occupations and pleasures, in order to give ourselves to Him with our whole soul, and to partake of His life. The people, only too ready to be satisfied with mere outward observance of the Sabbath, were continually reminded of this, the true meaning of consecration, by the prophets, whom Moses himself had raised to be the legal expositors of the law. Isaiah, in his discourse on entering upon office, chap. i. 13, declares that the mere outward observance of the Sabbath is an abomination to God. He gives a positive definition of the true hallowing of the Sabbath in chap. lviii. 13: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words." Doing thine own pleasure and thine own ways is here placed in opposition to the "keeping holy;" and their "own pleasure" he employs in its full extent and meaning, making it inclusive of the speaking of words, *i.e.* of such words as are nothing more than words, and tend neither to the honour of God nor to the edification of themselves and their neighbours—idle words. He insists so strongly on the inward disposition of mind, that he makes it a requisition that the Sabbath shall not be regarded as a heavy burden by which a man is taken away from his own work against his will, but as a gain, as a merciful privilege which God, whose commands are so many promises, gives to His own people as a refuge from the distractions and cares of the world. Moreover, Ezekiel says repeatedly in chap. xx., of the Israelites in the wilderness, that they grossly polluted the Sabbath of the Lord. There is no mention in the Pentateuch of the neglect of the outward rest of the Sabbath; on the contrary, Num. xv. 32 *sqq.* shows that it was strictly observed. The prophet can, therefore, only have reference to the desecration of the Sabbath by sin.

These remarks suffice to explain the main design of the institution of the Sabbath. It was the condition of the existence of the church of God. Human weakness, only too apt to forget its duties towards God, requires definite, regularly-recurring times devoted to the fulfilment of these duties only, setting aside all external hindrances. In order that the people might

be enabled to observe every day as a day of the Lord, on one definite, regularly-recurring day they were deprived of everything that was calculated to disturb devotion. Ewald justly characterizes the Sabbath as "the corrective of the people of God." Their business is to be holy, to live purely to the "Holy One:" "Be ye holy," is already in the Pentateuch set forth as an indispensable requirement, "for I am holy." But amid a life of toil and trouble the church cannot comply with this demand, unless with the help of regularly-recurring times of introspection, of assembly, and of edification. Among all the nations of antiquity Israel stands alone as a religious nation; in them alone religion manifests itself as an absolutely determining power. This, its high destination, its world-historical significance, it could only realize by the institution of the Sabbath. In the divine law, in the command relating to the Sabbath, after the general meaning of consecration had been set forth, among all the particulars included in it, rest alone is made primarily prominent and copiously developed. The religious day of the Old Testament also bears the name of rest. שָׁבַת, an intensive form, means wholly resting, a day of rest. This leads us to the fact that rest is of the highest importance for the observance of the Lord's day, and especially for life in God, and for the existence of the church. Incessant work makes man dull and lifeless, and destroys his susceptibility for salvation. According to Ex. xxxi. 13-17, the Sabbath is intended as a sign between God and His people; on the side of God, who instituted the Sabbath, a symbol of His election; on the side of the chosen, a confession to God—an oasis in the wilderness of the world's indifference to its Creator, of the non-attestation of God to the world; a nation serving God in spirit and in truth, whose beautiful worship was entrusted to them by God Himself.

From the definition of the nature of the observance of the Sabbath under the Old Testament it follows that, by virtue of its essence, it must be eternal, and is an exemplification of what our Lord says in Matt. v. 18. We, too, must consecrate ourselves to God; and in order to do this daily and hourly, in the midst of our work, we also must have regularly-recurring days of freedom from all occupation and distraction, for the weakness which made this a necessity under the Old Testament is

common to human nature at all times. We, too, must make public confession to God. But just as the whole Mosaic law is a particular application of an eternal idea to a definite people, so it is also with the command relating to the Sabbath. Therefore, side by side with the eternal moment, it must contain a temporal moment. This consists mainly in the following points:—(1.) The truths laid down as subjects of meditation for the Old Testament nation and for us, on the Lord's day, are various. Devotion has always reference to God as He has revealed Himself. Under the Old Testament it conceived of God as the Creator of the world and the Deliverer of Israel out of Egypt. The latter is set forth in Deut v. 12–15 as a subject of meditation in the observance of the Sabbath. Afterwards the subject became more extended, even under the Old Testament itself, by each new benefit of God, every new revelation of His nature. But the nucleus remained always the same. Nothing which occurred had power to supersede these two notions of God. Under the New Testament an essential change took place. God in Christ, this was now the great object of devotion. (2.) And with this the change of day is closely connected. The day on which the creation was ended, was now naturally superseded by the day on which redemption was fulfilled. The religious day of the Old Testament can only be the *κυριακὴ ἡμέρα*, Apoc. i. 10. (3.) The punishments attached to the neglect of the command respecting the Sabbath bear a specific Old Testament character: he who desecrates the Sabbath shall die the death. The punishments contained in the Mosaic law are essentially distinct from its commands. Their severity is in a great measure based on the presupposition of the weakness and spiritual lifelessness of the Old Covenant. But since Christ appeared in the flesh, and chiefly since He accomplished eternal redemption, since He poured out His Spirit upon flesh, the church is released from the necessity of dealing so roughly with the sinner—a necessity imposed upon it by sin. (4.) Nor can the details of the legal determination respecting the observance itself be transmitted unconditionally to the Christian church. This is evident from the command to kindle no fire, which had its foundation in the climatic relations peculiar to that nation to whom it was first of all given. Briefly, to sum up the matter, the law concerning

the Sabbath was expressly given to Israel alone, and hence in the letter it is binding upon them only; but, because it was given by God, it must contain a germ which forms the foundation of a law binding upon us also. Of the spirit of the command respecting the Sabbath, not a jot or a tittle can perish. What belongs to the kernel and what to the shell must be determined from the general relations which the Old and the New Testament bear to one another. That which cannot be reduced to anything peculiar to the Old Testament must retain its authority for us also.

A new temptation followed in the lack of water. The people had by their own fault neglected to drink of the spiritual rock which followed them, 1 Cor. x. 4; therefore they were unable to rise to the belief that God would assuage their bodily thirst. When for a moment they lost sight of the outward signs of God's presence, they ask, "Is Jehovah in our midst, or not?" An actual answer to the question was given in the water from the rock. The name of the place served for a perpetual memorial of the weakness with which they succumbed to the temptation, as a perpetual accusation against human nature, which is prone to quarrelling and contention, and as a warning to be on their guard against it. The fact is of importance, in so far as it gave rise to the first actual revolt of the people who had so shortly before beheld the glorious acts of God. And this circumstance explains the emphatically warning reference to the event contained in Ps. lxxxi. 8.

Formerly Israel had been tempted by hunger and thirst; now they are tempted by fear. They are attacked by the Amalekites. Here they are taught how Israel conquers only as Israel, how they can conquer men only in conquering God, and this by a living picture—Moses praying in sight of the whole nation, as its representative. If in weariness he allows his hands to sink, then Amalek gains the upper hand, however Israel may contend; if he raises them to heaven, Israel prevails. Raising the hands is the symbol of prayer among Israel, Ps. xxviii. 2, as well as among the heathen, though Kurtz has most unaccountably denied it. The raising of the hands symbolizes the raising of the heart on the part of an inferior to a superior. Already, in the book of Judith, emphasis is laid on the fact that Moses smote the Amalekites not with the sword,

but with holy prayer. 1 Tim. ii. 8, *βούλομαι οὖν προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας*, refers back to this passage. The meaning is the same which the Saviour brings out in Luke xviii. 1, by a parable: *Τὸ δεῖν πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι καὶ μὴ ἐκκακεῖν*. Here we have the counterpart to Jacob's struggle, equally rich in meaning. Amalek is to be regarded as the representative of the enemies of the kingdom of God. For this he was exactly adapted. He attacked Israel not as one Arab-Bedouin tribe now attacks another which shows signs of disturbing it in the occupation of its pasture. His attack was directed against Israel as the people of God. In this character they were confirmed by everything which had happened in Egypt and in the wilderness. All this Amalek knew, comp. Ex. xv. 14, 15; but it only served to increase his hatred towards Israel, his desire to try his strength with them. As Moses says, he wanted to lay his hand on the throne of God, Ex. xvii. 16, where 𐤀𐤍𐤊 is the poetical form for 𐤀𐤍𐤊𐤁 . This fighting against God, which had its origin in profound impiety, involved the Amalekites already at that time in defeat, and later in complete destruction, as was here solemnly prophesied, and fulfilled especially by Saul. We learn from Deut. xxv. 18 with what cruel anger and malice the Amalekites treated Israel. They would have been forgiven if they had ceased from their hatred towards the people of God, which was the more punishable because they were connected by ties of blood; but in this very circumstance we must look for the cause of the intensity of the hatred—they were envious of the undeserved preference given to Israel. But because the omniscient God foresees that no such change will take place, their destruction is unconditionally predicted. The same thing is afterwards repeated by Balaam in Num. xxiv. 20, "Amalek was the first of the nations (*i.e.* the mightiest among the heathen nations which at that time stood in connection with Israel), but his latter end shall be that he perish for ever,"—words in which Balaam only changes into a verbal prophecy the actual prophecy, which lay in the conduct of the Amalekites themselves.

At the close of the section let us glance once more at the way which the Israelites took from the exodus till their arrival at Sinai. They set out from the territory of Goshen, the eastern part of Lower Egypt, principally from the town

Raamses, where they were assembled waiting for permission to set out: comp. Ex. xii. 37. V. Raumer, *Beitr.* S. 4, here makes Raamses to stand for the country Raamses, in defence of a preconceived opinion; but the Pentateuch knows only the town Raamses. This town, which probably got its name from its founder, the king Raamses, is only mentioned *per prolepsin* in Gen. xlvii. 11, where the land of Goshen is called the land of Raamses, *i.e.* the land whose principal town is Raamses: comp. Rosellini i. *Monumenti*, etc. i. 1, p. 300. For the Egyptian kings who bear the name Raamses probably belong only to the time after Joseph. The town was therefore built in the time between Joseph and Moses. The command to depart was not given to the children of Israel suddenly; it had already long been understood that they were soon to set out, and already for fourteen days everything had been prepared for it in Raamses, the central-point, the residence of Moses and Aaron, and throughout all the land of Goshen, through which the instructions of Moses had spread with the rapidity consequent on the unsettled condition of the people. The march began at Raamses, and in their progress they were joined on all sides by accessories. On the second day of the march the Israelites reached the northern point of the Arabian Gulf, Etham, which probably occupied the site of the present Bir Suez. From Etham they journeyed up the western side of the Arabian Gulf as far as Suez, where they crossed it. From this point they reached Mara in three days, passing through the wilderness Sur, the south-west part of the desert et-Tih, and along the eastern coast of the Gulf of Suez. Burckhardt (followed by Robinson, part i. p. 107) has rightly identified Mara with the well Howara, which he discovered on the usual route to Mount Sinai, about eighteen hours from Suez. The remoteness and the character of the water favour his view. Ritter says, p. 819, "In the space of this three days' march there is no spring-water, and this Ain Howara, which lies on the only possible route, is the only absolutely bitter spring on the whole coast, which accounts for the complaining and murmuring of the people, who were accustomed to the salutary and pleasant-tasted water of the Nile." From Mara the Israelites penetrated to Elim, Ex. xv. 27, where they found wells of water and palm trees. Burckhardt has identified this Elim

with the valley of Ghurundel, which is almost a mile in width, and abounds with trees and living springs, and is about three hours' journey from the well Howara. So also Robinson, who remarks (p. 111) that this place is still much resorted to for water by the Arabs. Ritter says of the Wadi Ghurundel (p. 829): "In times of rain the wadi pours great masses of water to the sea. Therefore it still afforded good pasturage in October. It was thickly covered with palms and tamarisk trees, and wild parties in the solitary valley gave a romantic character to the Elim of the ancients." We remark, in passing, that Moses probably gives prominence to the fact that the wells of water in Elim were twelve, and the palms which grew so luxuriantly out of them were seventy, because he looked upon it as a symbol, a representation of the blessing which should proceed from Israel, as the source of blessing, upon all nations of the earth. Twelve is the signature of Israel, and seventy is the number of the nations in the table of nations, Gen. x. The twelve apostles and the seventy disciples rest upon the same numerical symbolism. According to Num. xxxiii. 6, the Israelites next came to a station which lay on the sea-coast. Even now the caravan-route touches on the sea just at the mouth of the Wadi Taibe, about five hours from Ghurundel. Formerly the Israelites had repaired to the neighbourhood of the Red Sea; now they turned eastwards in order to reach Sinai. The caravan-route to Sinai, accessible from ancient times, leads through the valley Mocattab. This is probably the station of the wilderness of Sin, Ex. xvi. 1 (notwithstanding Robinson's objections). The valley is wide, and contains wells and manna-tamarisks. Here the Israelites first received manna. From Sin they passed on to Rephidim, a plain at the foot of Mount Horeb, from whence they repaired to the wilderness of Sinai, and encamped opposite this mountain, which has been characterized by Robinson as a sanctuary in the midst of a great circle of granite district, having only one entrance, which is easy of access. It was a secret, sacred spot, cut off from the world by solitary, bare mountains, and therefore well adapted as a place for the nation that dwelt alone, with whom the Lord desired to hold converse in their solitude.

§ 5.

THE COVENANT ON SINAI.

If we follow v. Hofmann, we relinquish all idea of a covenant of God with Israel. In his opinion (*Prophecy and Fulfilment*, p. 138) ברית does not mean covenant, but determination, establishment. On closer examination, however, we shall readily convince ourselves that this meaning is not at all applicable in by far the greater number of passages; while, on the other hand, those few passages which v. Hofmann cites in favour of his theory may easily be reduced to mean covenant. The term covenant is applied to circumcision as a covenant-sacrament, to the law as representative of the covenant condition, to the Messiah as the mediator of the covenant, and to the divine promise because it always implies an obligation, even when this is not actually expressed. The covenant now in question must not be regarded as something altogether new. God had already concluded a covenant with Abraham, and that this had reference to all his descendants appears from the circumstance that by divine command all bore the sign and seal of the covenant. The blessing of the covenant already encircled the Israelites during their whole residence in the wilderness, and promoted their great increase; and under the cross they still maintained the covenant blessing. In every threat to Pharaoh God calls Israel His people. The covenant on Sinai was therefore a solemn renewal of that which already existed. It is related to the earlier, as confirmation is related to baptism. The nation which had been born into the covenant now with free consciousness makes a vow to observe it, and receives a renewal of the divine promise.

What is a covenant of God with man? At the first glance it seems as if such a thing were impossible, and the idea appears to have its basis in a rude conception of the relation of God to man. We belong to God from the beginning, body and soul. We are created by Him, and therefore to Him. How, then, can it be necessary that He should first purchase us to be His property, that He should make good His claims to our obedience by special benefits? From this it follows that God could conclude a covenant with Israel only by the deepest condescen-

sion ; and hence we are led to infer the depth of that human corruption which made such condescension necessary. God, in whom we live, move, and are, ought to be near to us ; but He is by nature as far from us as if He did not exist at all. His revelation in nature is to us a sealed book. We have lost the key to its hieroglyphics. We forget that we stand in a natural covenant-relation towards Him, that we receive rich gifts from Him, and that He has high claims to make on us. But in His mercy He does not let us go. He gives up the claims which He has as a Creator ; He becomes our Father for the second time, and brings back His alienated property by redemption. The less we are divine the more He becomes human. Because the time has not yet come to reveal Himself thus to the whole human race, He does it first to a single nation, but to it on behalf of the whole human race. By free choice He becomes their God. Among this nation He founds the theocracy,—a name which was first employed by Josephus, while Scripture designates the same thing by the word covenant, a word which is highly characteristic of the thing, since it embraces the two elements which here come into consideration: that of the gift and the promise, and that of the obligation, indicating the special gifts by which God distinguished Israel from the other nations, and the particular obligations which grew out of this relation to God. As the thing here comes into full effect, this is the place to treat of it.

When we hear of the covenant of God with Israel, or of theocracy, it generally suggests to us a relation of God to Israel which had no natural basis, and which at the beginning of the New Testament entirely ceased at one blow (a mode of consideration which has been only too much encouraged by most of those who have written on this subject). Consistently carried out, it results in theocracy being transferred from the region of reality into that of imagination. For if it were really a divine institution, it must also, in accordance with its essence, be eternal, in which case the form can belong only to this single nation, to whose wants it is adapted. The sacred writers are far removed from this mode of consideration. It is true, they recognise with deep gratitude that God stands in a relation to their nation such as He bears to no other ; but this relation is to them only a potentialization of the universal—the idea of

Jehovah rests upon that of Elohim: God could not be King of Israel in a special sense unless he were King of the whole world. His special providence in rewarding and punishing had universal providence for its substratum. They are also far from regarding that which was given to Israel before other nations as withdrawn from these for ever. The extension of theocracy over the whole earth, while it had formerly existed only among Israel, the universal change of the general into the particular, is to them the most characteristic mark of the Messianic time. In the similarity of essence they take no heed of the difference of form. We shall now show in detail how, in all the properties of the theocracy, the particular rests upon the basis of the universal, the temporal on the basis of the eternal, and how the word of the Lord is here verified, that of the law of God not a jot or a tittle can perish.

1. In the theocracy God was the lawgiver. It is generally asserted that among the heathen, and also among Christian nations, the laws were given, not by God, but by distinguished men who stood at the head of the nation. But whence, then, did these get their laws? Were they mere arbitrary whims? By no means. God is everywhere the source of all right. He implanted in man the idea of right and wrong. Even the worst legislation contains a divine element; and those who know nothing of God speak in God's name. The peculiarity of the theocracy was only this, that in it the law of God was exempt from the many disfigurements which are inevitable so long as it is written only on the uniform tablets of the human heart; and a correction for all times is thus given to the natural law. Again, the application of the idea of right to special relations was not left, as among the heathen, to unenlightened reason, or, as among Christian nations, to enlightened reason, but was given by God Himself in its minutest details. Thus the holiness of that law which in all its determinations rested upon the immediate authority of the highest Lawgiver, was increased, while legislation was raised far above the age. How far it reached beyond that age, and how little it can be regarded as a product of the time, appears most clearly from the lively conflict which it had to maintain with the spirit of the nation during the march through the wilderness, and from the long series of revolts to which it gave rise, and which at last resulted

in the rejection of the whole race. By this means a pattern and a test were given to that more advanced time, which was so far matured as to be able to make its own application of the idea of right to special relations. But we must not, therefore, overlook the circumstance that even under the Old Testament wide scope was given to the legislative activity of man, and the right which was customary was reformed only in so far as it required reformation, while in whole departments free play was given to its successive natural development. It is very incorrect to imagine that the Pentateuch was the exclusive source of right to Israel. With regard to the right of inheritance, for example, we find only three solitary injunctions, and with respect to buying and selling there is not a word. In all cases provision is made only for that which could not be left to natural development,—that which had special reference to the minority of the nation, and its immaturity in a religious and moral aspect. This observation also serves to lessen the chasm between theocracy and all other forms of government.

2. For the covenant-people God was not only the source of right, but also its basis. Every transgression was regarded as an offence against Him, and so punished. He who did not honour his father and mother was punishable, because in dishonouring them he violated that image of God which they bore in a definite sense. Whoever injured his neighbour incurred guilt, partly because in him he despised that divine image which is implanted in all, and is worthy of honour even in its remnant; and partly from his disregard to that which is peculiar to the members of the covenant, whom God esteemed worthy of such high honour, and to whom He imparted the seal of His covenant. This is clearly shown in the Decalogue, the fundamental law. Fear of God and love towards Him are there made the foundation of the whole fulfilling of the law, and in the very introduction the obligation to keep all the commandments is based upon the relation to the Lord. Exodus xx. 6 expressly terms love to God the fulfilling of the law. That the commandments of the second table do not lie loosely beside those of the first already appears from the ratio *legi adjecta*, the רצף. The children of Israel are friends only through their common relation to the Lord. Only by accepting this principle can we clearly understand the position of the command

to honour our parents. Easy and appropriate arrangement: Thou shalt honour and love God in Himself, vers. 3-11; in those who represent His rule upon earth, ver. 12; in all who bear His image, vers. 13-17. The peculiarity here is only the establishment of the commandments upon that which God has done for Israel, on the common relation to Him as the God of Israel. While, among the heathen, laws are founded upon that which is common to all men, among Christians, especially upon that which God has done for us in Christ, the *laesis proximi* here appears in its most glaring light, because it affects a brother redeemed by Christ. Here also the theocratic is only a particular modification of the universal. Without God there is no sin, no duty, no right. Hence we can no longer speak of punishment in the proper sense, but only of means to render harmless those who are injurious to the interests of society. Where God disappears revolution infallibly sets in, all rights are trodden under foot, and there arises a *bellum omnium contra omnes*.

3. All power among the covenant-people was regarded as an efflux of the divine supremacy. Judges administered justice in the name of God. Hence, "to stand before the Lord," instead of "to appear before the tribunal of judgment," Deut. i. 17, xix. 17. In His name executive power acted, and thus it became of no consequence by whom it was administered. The law which has reference to the demand made by the people for a king, Deut. xvii., sufficiently shows that even the monarchical form of government was not inconsistent with the covenant. And the essential element was only this, that the government should not make itself independent of God. It is a monstrous error when Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Israel*, ii. S. 207 f., makes the theocracy an absolute antithesis to all human government; the antithesis is only that of dependent and independent human government. If this be misunderstood in the face of the plainest and most numerous facts, we attribute to Moses a groundless fanaticism. This, therefore, is the peculiarity, that the power conferred by God manifests itself as such more clearly and sharply than elsewhere, that the law of God comes more visibly into play, that He interferes more promptly and palpably when the rulers depart from Him, or when the nation rejects Him by disobedience to authority.

Moreover, all supremacy is of God, Rom. xiii. 1. Every king bears His image, and this alone gives him the right to rule and makes it the duty of subjects to obey. To give to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, and to God that which is God's, to fear God and honour the king, appear inseparably connected under the New Testament. According to Eph. iii. 15, every fatherhood, every relation of ruler and ruled upon the earth, is a reflection of the fatherhood of God. Only by confounding hierarchy with theocracy would it be possible to place a far higher value on that which was specifically Israelitish in the theocracy than it really had. It is perfectly clear that among Israel God ruled without a priesthood. According to law the priests have no political, but only a religious position. Everywhere their office is made to consist in the conduct of divine worship and the instruction of the people. After the appearance of Moses the political and judicial power still remained in the hands of the rulers of the people, but in difficult cases judges were at liberty to seek counsel from the priests as teachers of the law. The covenant allowed free scope to the development of the state. It recognised the existing government as ordained by God, while, at the same time, the lawgiver declared that a future alteration was in itself perfectly consistent with it. This is now so plainly manifest that even rationalism can no longer refuse to recognise it. Bertheau, in his *History of the Israelites*, p. 252, says, "The state power is not in the hands of the priests; they are only called upon to represent the collective body of the Israelites before God, and to watch over the purity and holiness of the community; but as priests they can neither give laws nor guide the state."

God makes known, through Moses, that as King of His people He will strictly punish all disobedience against His laws and will richly reward the faithful observance of them. The Magna Charta of the theocracy in this respect is Deut. xxviii. The truth of these threats and promises is shown by the history, which is really entirely contained in them, and by the fate of the earlier covenant-people, even to the present day. Here also the particular rests only on the universal. Even the heathen have much to say of Nemesis. Schiller says, "The history of the world is the judgment of the world." And our Saviour says, "Where the carcase is, there will the eagles be

gathered together." The peculiarity of the theocracy was only this, that in it the judgments of God were sharper than those inflicted on the heathen, because the offence, which is always proportioned to the gift of God, was greater, comp. Lev. x. 3; Amos iii. 1, 2; 1 Pet. iv. 17; that they appeared more promptly and regularly, while God frequently suffered the heathen nations to remain in their sins, outwardly happy; that they were more palpable, because the history of Israel was designed to manifest to all nations and all times the divine retribution, that in this rude writing they might learn to read the finer also; finally, that by the divine ordinance punishment and blessing were always made known to the nation as such, comp. Amos iii. 7, "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets."

5. God as the King of Israel took care that His people should never want means of recognising His will, and for this He gave ordinary means. Upon the priesthood which He had established He enjoined the study of the law, of the authentic revelation of the will of God, comp. Lev. x. 10, 11; Deut. xxxi. 9 ff., xxxiii. 10; and facility was given to them for this purpose. The tribe of Levi was called to the priesthood because the new principle had taken deeper root in it than in any of the rest, comp. Ex. xxxii. 26-35; Num. xxv. 6-9; Deut. xxxiii. 9; but the complicated character of the Mosaic-religious legislation demanded a hereditary priesthood,—it required a priesthood formed by hereditary tradition and early education. But the book of the law was not designed merely for the priesthood. It was given by Moses to the elders of the people no less than to the priests, Deut. xxxi. 9. Every seven years it was to be read to the whole assembled nation, v. 12; the king was to make a copy of it for himself, and to read in this every day of his life, Deut. xvii. 19. When ordinary means did not suffice, God vouchsafed extraordinary. The high priest, clothed with the holy insignia of office, the Urim and Thummim, asked it in the name of the nation, in living faith, certain that God would give him the right answer in his heart. In times of apostasy, when the ordinary ministers did not adequately fulfil their calling, when the knowledge of divine truth had become obscured, and the fear of God seemed to be quite dead, God raised up prophets, instruments of His Spirit, who, endowed with infallible know-

ledge of His will, again gave prominence to it, and quickened the decaying piety; and this is the main thing. Nor was it a later addition; but the original founding of the theocracy was associated with a belief that it would be maintained by extraordinary powers and gifts, just as it had been established by them: comp. Deut. xviii. 15, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet, like unto me;" and the prophetic law, Deut. xiii. 2-6, and xviii. 15-22. This law formed the foundation for the activity of the prophets, which is only intelligible on the assumption of its existence. Without possessing such a right, how could they have acted in conformity with the mode and manner of their appearance? By this law no prophet could be called to account so long as he prophesied in the name of the true God, and so long as he predicted nothing that did not pass into fulfilment. Here, also, it must not be overlooked that even in the heathen world there was a faint analogy to this prerogative of the covenant-people, in the feeble rays of light which God permitted to shine through their darkness, comp. Rom. i. 18 ff.; and by virtue of its essence the same thing still continues among the nation of the new covenant. The church of the New Testament has a pure source of knowledge of the divine will in the Holy Scriptures. It has a ministry appointed by God to spread the knowledge of the truth. In it also every obscuring of divine truth is a prophecy of the approaching illumination, every degeneracy of ordinary means for the apprehension of the divine will is a prophecy of the preparation of extraordinary messengers. The appearance of an Athanasius, of a Luther, a Spener, and a Francke, rests upon the same divine necessity as the appearance of an Isaiah and a Jeremiah. The difference lies only in the form. The Old Testament messengers had a stronger external authority in the gift of prophecy, and, when the danger of complete apostasy was especially great, in the power to perform miracles. Under the New Testament, when the Spirit worked more powerfully in the heart of the church, which had acquired a firm position, the ordinary operations of the Spirit sufficed. A similar relation exists between those who are called to watch over the external welfare of the kingdom of God. Thus the appearance of a Samson and a Gustavus Adolphus depends on the same divine causality. But how great is the difference in form!

6. Another essential characteristic of the theocracy was this, that God dwelt among His people, that the sanctuary erected to Him was not without *praesens numen*, but was rather a tabernacle of God among men. In this way, in the type and prefiguration of His incarnation, God came into close contact with the nation. The temple, the priesthood, and the yearly feasts depend on the presence of God in the nation. It was prescribed by law that each one should appear before God at the place of the sanctuary three times a year; in subsequent practice, however, only the annual appearance at the feast of the passover, as the principal festival, was regarded as an absolute religious duty. Israel had in reality what the heathen only imagined they had, and this is the only form suitable for the necessities of that time, as we see from the analogy of the heathen. The form has now changed, but the essence, far from having ceased, is present among us in still stronger manifestations; and this advance forms one of the main distinctions between the Old and New Testaments. Apart from it, the change of form would not have been possible. Since Christ appeared in the flesh, since He made His dwelling in the heart, and abides constantly with us; where only two or three are gathered together, there He is in the midst of them; these *πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα* (Gal. iv. 9) have ceased. The chasm between heaven and earth is completely filled up; there is no longer any need of the lower representation of God, because God is there in most real presence.

We have still a few words to say respecting the duration of the theocracy. This is differently estimated by different writers. Some, such as Spencer, make it end with the establishment of royalty; others, such as Hess, regard it as having extended to the Babylonian exile; while others again, such as Warburton, asserted that it lasted until Christ. We must, first of all, premise that the theocracy can only be said to have ceased in a certain sense. This is sufficiently shown by what has already been said. By virtue of its essence the theocracy must be eternal. Otherwise it could never have existed. Ewald excellently remarks, "Here, for the first time, is a kingdom which recognises an end and aim external to itself, which neither had a human origin, nor can advance by human means, and by virtue of its rejection of all that is not divine, bears in itself

the germ of infinite duration." Such a kingdom can only pass away as the grain of corn passes into the blade. Its destruction cannot belong to the future, but only its fulfilment. Already the prophets regard the matter in this light. They proclaim the extension of the kingdom of God, which had hitherto been limited to a single nation, over the whole earth, and its complete subjugation of the kingdom of the world, comp. Isa. ii.; Dan. ii. vii. The Saviour does not distinctly assert that the theocracy, the βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, will cease, but He says, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to another people bearing its fruits. Nor is it taken from all Israel, but the unbelieving portion of the nation is thrust out from it, while the heathen unite themselves with the believing portion. The twelve tribes of Israel, to whom the heathen merely attached themselves, still form the church of God in παλιγγενεσία: comp. Matt. xix. 28; Apoc. vii. 4. Only with reference to its form can the theocracy be said to have ceased. Unquestionably, therefore, this cessation took place at Christ's death. How it can be regarded as having ceased on the establishment of royalty, we can scarcely conceive. No essential change in the form of the theocracy occurred at that time. We learn how little the kingly dignity was in itself opposed to the divine supremacy, not only from Deut. xvii., but also from the announcements in Genesis, in which reference is made to royalty among Israel, as to one of the greatest blessings of the future. Moreover, David found his highest honour in being the servant of God, and under his rule the theocracy attained its deepest reality. In Judges xvii. 6 royalty is represented as progress towards something better: "In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes." Many later kings, indeed, abused their power, and sought to make themselves independent of God. But this only gave rise to the stronger assertion of the theocracy, partly through the prophets and partly by divine judgments. The theory which makes the cessation of the theocracy coincident with the return from captivity, is equally untenable. The prophet-hood certainly became extinct. This is the only apparent argument which can be adduced. But it did not cease for ever—it revived again in John, as in Samuel; after having exercised but little influence during the whole time from Moses to

him, though in a certain sense it continued even in the interval; the longing after new communications from God became the more intense by the fact of their absence. But the earlier prophets, especially Daniel and Zechariah, had provided even for this period; the prophethood did not cease until it had given counsel, comfort, and exhortation for every need. Virtually, therefore, it still continued; but the commands of God, specially destined for this time, were drawn from the Holy Scriptures, instead of the mouth of the prophets. At the death of Christ, on the other hand, there ensued a great change, not only in the fact that the greater part of Israel had completely broken the covenant—though this alone is generally brought forward; but there ensued a change, which could only result in the passing away of the earlier form, though not otherwise than as a seed of corn passes into the blade. It may be said, that with the death of Christ the temple at Jerusalem, as such, was destroyed. For now the relation of God to the world was altered; now arose the possibility of an inner union, of a richer participation in the Spirit, so that from this time forth God could be worshipped in spirit; faith raised itself powerfully to Him without any further need of such a prop. It would have been a gross anachronism to wish still to adhere to the temple at Jerusalem, after Christ had been exalted to the right hand of the Father, and the realization of His promise to be with His own to the end of the world had begun. When the sun rises, other lights are put out. With the death of Christ the whole theocratic institution of sacrifices was done away, for in His death the idea of sacrifice was realized. With Him the whole letter of the ceremonial law was abrogated.

This section is twofold: it contains the conclusion of the covenant and the giving of the law. Both are closely connected. The covenant presupposes reciprocity, as we have already said. Therefore, before it could be solemnly concluded, the covenant-nation must be told what they have to do. This explains the order of events; first, the question to the people whether, in grateful recognition of all the favours which the Lord had vouchsafed to them, they would obey Him in all things, and the subsequent promise that He would henceforward manifest Himself as Jehovah. Then, after the affirmation of the people, the sketch of the divine commandments, to which obe-

dience was required, so that all which followed was only amplification in idea. The whole law is already fully given here. That the Decalogue is the quintessence of the whole legislation is indicated by the number ten, and by the circumstance that "the words of the covenant," Ex. xxxiv. 28, is applied only to the Decalogue in the ark of the covenant, while the book of the law is treated as mere supplement. It is shown also in the solemn ratification and reception of the law by the nation, and in the solemn conclusion of the covenant.

And this is the place to make a few remarks relative to the nature and design of the revelation of the law to Israel.

The relation of the law to the economy of the Old Testament has very frequently been quite misapprehended by a misconception of the Pauline representation. It has been forgotten that Paul had not to do with the meaning of law generally, but only with the special relation of the law to the carnal-minded, those who were sold under sin. The law has been completely severed from the grace which accompanies it, so that the favour becomes a mockery.

The living God commanded nothing without at the same time giving that which was commanded. Each of His commands is a simultaneous promise. And that this promise was fulfilled in many under the Old Testament is shown by the numerous examples of piety which it contains. They prized the law as sweeter than honey and the honeycomb, Ps. xix. 11; they were grateful to the Lord for leading them in His ways; they prayed that He would not take His Holy Spirit from them, Ps. li. 11; that He would create in them a clean heart, in conformity with the actual promise which He had given them in circumcision. The prerogative of Israel over the heathen did not consist merely in the fact that the law was given to them on stone tables; in this they had a pledge that God would write it on the table of their heart, as we read in Prov. vii. 3, "Bind them upon thy fingers, write them upon the table of thy heart." The difference between the Old and New Testament in this respect is only relative. The latter possesses, on the one hand, more powerful means to break the heart of the natural man, to remove his hardness and at the same time his despair; and, on the other hand, it imparts to those who are thus prepared a more effectual assistance of the Holy Spirit for the subjective

realization of the law, which could only be given after the atoning death of Christ.

From this standpoint we can more accurately define the relation of the Old to the New Testament pentecost than is generally done, when they are apprehended as in pure antithesis, and the law is represented as the letter of the first Old Testament pentecost and the spirit of the second New Testament pentecost. By this view the Old Testament pentecost is changed into a mere outward memorial feast. But if it be apprehended that in the first passover the law was written immediately upon the heart, as David says in Ps. xl. 8, "I delight to do Thy will, O my God, yea Thy law is within my heart," then every subsequent Old Testament feast of pentecost, solemnized at God's command, is a pledge of the continuous realization of the promise given in and with the law. The first Old Testament pentecost is at the same time the last of the Old Testament, the end only in so far as it is the fulfilment. God would not have kept His covenant if He had not brought about the fulfilment. The essence of the Christian and the Old Testament pentecost is the same; the former is only an advance on the latter. They are related to one another, as circumcision to baptism, as the Old to the New Testament passover. The Old Testament passover is the pledge of the continuing forgiveness of sin; pentecost, of continuing sanctification. The feast of pentecost had moreover a natural side, besides that which has already been mentioned. As in the feast of the passover the first-fruits were presented, so pentecost was the feast of the end of the corn-harvest. In this way Israel was made conscious of the ethical condition of the benefits of nature, and was reminded of the saying, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things will be added unto you." The harvest blessing has its root in reconciliation and sanctification.

The one main object of the communication of the law is thus already indicated. In Ex. xix. 6 God declares that Israel shall be a kingdom of priests and an holy nation. The peculiarity of the priesthood consisted in the closeness of their relation to God. A holy nation must represent God's holiness on earth. And that the nation might fulfil this its high destiny, God gave a copy of His own holiness in the law. By this means He

showed them the aim which is partially or entirely concealed from the eyes of the natural man, gave them a safe rule for their actions, which even the well-disposed have need of; and to those who were filled with gratitude and love by His manifestations of mercy, He imparted inner power to reach the goal. In His mercy He pardoned their sins of weakness, in accordance with the promise which He gave on the founding of the pass-over feast and the institution of sin-offerings. Thus there sprang up among the covenant-people a germ of those in whom His idea was realized, without whom a covenant-people cannot have any existence, and who cannot be wanting at any period. If their existence cannot be proved, the *βασίλεια τοῦ Θεοῦ* becomes a mere fable. They are the צִדִּיקִים, who meet us in almost every psalm, and so often in the prophets, especially in the second part of Isaiah, in strong contrast to the dead members of the community of God; who meet us again on the threshold of the New Testament in Zacharias, Elisabeth, John the Baptist, and Hanna. But this activity of the law must be preceded by another; before sanctification can come into operation, there must be recognition of sin, the fundamental condition of reconciliation, which forms the only possible basis of sanctification. We are led to this definition of the law by its name עֲרִית, testimony, in so far as it bears testimony against sin and the sinner: comp. *Beitr.* vol. 3, p. 640 ff. The law first accuses and compels to the reception of the offered reconciliation. Afterwards, by the forgiveness of sin, the accusation and condemnation of the law are silenced so far as the penitent is concerned. Not until man finds himself in a state of grace, and the innermost disposition of his heart is in unison with the law—for sin is loved until it is forgiven—can the law begin its work of sanctification.

But even for the mass of the people, in whom the destination of the law was not perfectly realized, it was not given in vain. It created discipline, morality, and the fear of God. The fearful manifestations which accompanied the giving of the law were well adapted to give birth to the latter, even in coarse minds; and when it disappeared, God knew how to reawaken it by the ever-continuing realization of these actual threats, as we see from the example of the time of the Judges, especially of the Babylonian exile, which was followed, if not by universal love

towards God, yet by universal fear, so that the worship of idols was abolished at one stroke. But what the law accomplished in this respect formed a basis for the realization of its main object. Discipline, morals, and the fear of God in the multitude are the foundation for the erection of the structure of the living faith of the elect. And this faith of the elect was the necessary condition of the coming of Christ. The ἀπολύτρωσις cannot be conceived of apart from the προσδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν. How could the Saviour have appeared among Israel if the Israel which Josephus puts before us in horrible manifestation had been the whole of Israel? But at the same time care was taken that the faithful should be satisfied only in so far as to awaken a longing after the highest satisfaction; to them the law always remained relatively external, so that it became for them the παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν. The highest step under the Old Testament only stood on a level with the lowest under the New Testament; comp. Luke xvii. 28, where it would not do to substitute the superlative for the comparative, so that no one was too rich and too contented to be willing to receive from Christ.

The object of the giving of the law will have been made plain from these remarks. It was intended to effect: 1. discipline; 2. conviction of sin; 3. sanctification. A time was chosen for the giving of the law in which the nation was raised above itself by the great deeds of the Lord, and was willing to submit to the discipline and the constraint of a new position to which its inner temperament did not yet correspond. The inspiration soon cooled again; but however much the nation struggled against the law which had once been accepted, yet this proved itself to be leaven which by degrees leavened the whole mass.

We have still to define the mutual relation of the ceremonial law and the moral law, in opposition to very wide-spread error. The former, it is generally assumed, was completely abolished by Christ, while the latter remains binding for all time. But this view is totally incorrect. The Mosaic law forms one inseparable whole; in a certain sense it was quite abrogated by Christ, and no longer concerns the church of the New Testament, but in a certain sense it was fully ratified by Christ, the ceremonial, no less than the moral law.

The continuance of the whole law becomes clear simply on the ground that it was given entirely by God. If this be established, it cannot consist altogether of arbitrary enactments, but must contain a kernel of eternal truth. And so it appears on closer consideration. Every ceremonial law, even that which is apparently most external, is only an embodied moral law, an incorporated idea which can be divested of that body which it only assumed with reference to the stage of development of a certain nation, but has never surrendered anything of its peculiar essence. Look for instance at circumcision, the idea of which still remains in force, although in baptism it has assumed a new form. The duration of the whole law also appears from the definite statements of the Holy Scriptures. *Instar omnium* applies here, Matt. v. 17–19. There the Lord asserts, in the strongest expressions, the eternal duration of the whole law, to its very smallest detail, and its binding power for the members of the new covenant.

But in another aspect the whole law is to be considered as abrogated. Pure moral law, such as had no special reference to Israel, and may be transferred to the Christian church without that modification to which the ceremonial law must be subjected, is not to be found in the Old Testament. We shall illustrate this by the example of the Decalogue, which is generally considered as the most free from all national reference. At all events, this is not its prominent characteristic. It is designed to be the quintessence of the whole legislation, which is related to it only as further extension and amplification. We see that the Decalogue points to later supplements by the fact that it contains no punitive enactments. From this it necessarily follows that the kernel is of more value than the shell, the eternal element of more value than the temporal. It gives only that which is most simple and most original. In the first table there are five commands respecting the relation to the *ὑπερέχοντες*, the authorities, to God and those who represent His dominion upon earth (for the command to honour parents belongs to the first table). The second table also contains five commandments, relative to neighbours, equals. But even here the temporal element is not entirely wanting. The reason of the obligation, contained in the introduction, concerns Israel alone. For the Christian church, the redemption from Egypt is superseded by

redemption through Christ. The Old Testament itself declares that at a future time the former will give place absolutely to the later (Jer. xxiii. 7). The command respecting the Sabbath also bears a specifically Old Testament character, in so far as it strictly enjoins the celebration of the seventh day, and partially insists upon rest, taking the creation of the world for its principal basis. By neighbours we must first of all understand only the members of the covenant-nation, the co-Israelites, etc.

We must, therefore, infer that the letter of the whole Mosaic law is done away, while its spirit remains eternal. Its authority rests not so much upon the circumstance that it is in unison with the law of our reason, but upon the fact that God gave this law through Moses. We do not become free from this authority until we are able to prove that a legal determination does not belong to the essence, but only to the special Old Testament form. We only remark further, that on this subject there is good material to be found in the work of Bialloblotzky, *de legis Mosaicæ abrogatione*, Gott. 1824, although his conclusion is not quite correct. Adopting many of the one-sided incautious expressions of Luther, the author has too much overlooked the fact that the Old Testament law, as a copy of the divine holiness, is imperishable with regard to its essence, and must remain valid even for the church of the New Testament.

We have still a few remarks to make with special reference to the aim and signification of the ceremonial law. In accordance with what has been said, the principal value must be attached to its meaning. There is no ceremonial law which is not symbolical, and, as symbolical, typical. The older theologians have erred only in separating the typical from the symbolical, and instead of seeking it in the idea, have sought it in little externalities. To have understood and avoided this error is the great merit of Bähr's *Symbolism of the Mosaic Worship*, 2 vols., Heidelberg, 1837-39, a book which has much that is valuable in other respects, but must be used with great caution on account of its many arbitrary assertions. We shall illustrate the symbolical and typical character of the law by a few examples. After the completion of the tabernacle of the covenant, all sacred things and persons were anointed. Oil is in Scripture the symbol of

the Spirit of God; the anointing of the sanctuary, a graphic representation of the communication of this Spirit to the church of God, which is by this means consecrated and set apart from all others, lying without the department of the operations of divine grace, comp. Isa. lxiii. 11. So much for the symbol. The communication of the Spirit to the theocracy was still incomplete. Moses himself recognises this when he expresses the wish that all the people might prophesy, *i.e.* might enter into immediate spiritual union with God: Num. xi. 19. This wish, which contains a recognition of the spirit of godlessness which was still prevalent at that time, is based on the notion of a people of God, and is therefore also prophecy. Thus that which is an image of the already-existing is at the same time a type of the future. Because God has given the beginning, He must also bring about the end. The former is no chance act of caprice, but rests upon the relation of God to the theocracy; and this same relation demands also fulfilment. From Dan. xii. 24 we learn that this typical meaning was already recognised under the Old Testament itself. Again, the third among the great annual feasts, the feast of tabernacles, was a symbolical representation of the gracious guidance of the Lord in the time of trial and temptation, and thus a necessary supplement to the feast of the passover, as the feast of the bestowment of forgiveness of sins, and to pentecost, as the feast of the internal and external giving of the law or the feast of consecration. The passover corresponds to sin-offering, pentecost to burnt-offering, the feast of tabernacles to peace-offering. But the symbol was at the same time type, not only of God's future similar dealings with this nation, but also of His treatment of those who were resolved to become His people. The feast of tabernacles points prophetically to that of the church militant of the New Testament, to the march throughout the wilderness of this earth, comp. Apoc. xii. 6-14, to salvation granted, and to the final happy issue of this march. Zech. xiv. 16 expressly mentions the feast of tabernacles as a type. And again in the Apoc. vii. 9. Besides the historical side, according to which the feast of tabernacles was one of gratitude for the gracious preservation of the Lord during the pilgrimage of Israel through the wilderness, comp. Lev. xxiii. 43, and a pledge of the continuance of this preservation, this feast had

also a natural side, like the passover and pentecost. It was the feast of the completed gathering in of all fruits. This natural side stood in close connection with the historical. Bähr says: "There was certainly no time better adapted than this to remind them of the hardships endured in their wanderings in the desert, of the time of the trial of their faith, of the great benefit conferred on them in the possession of the promised and wished-for land, and in the final entrance into rest after the struggle." With respect to the natural side also the typical meaning of the feast of tabernacles is clearly apparent. It prefigured the heavenly harvest, the time when the elect, who kept the passover and pentecost in the spirit, rest from their work, and their works do follow them, since they have well invested what they here gained by the sweat of their brow, and what God's blessing had bestowed on them. Again, the yearly great day of atonement was deeply significant for Israel, Lev. xvi. The ceremonial of this day was as follows: The high priest first presents a sin-offering as an atonement for himself and his house. Then he takes two goats as a sin-offering for the house of Israel. One of these is actually offered up, the other only in and with it. Aaron lays both his hands upon its head and confesses upon it the (forgiven and obliterated) trespasses of the children of Israel, lays them upon its head and sends it to Azazel—*i.e.* to Satan—in the wilderness. The meaning of this symbolical action is, that when God's people have sought and obtained forgiveness of their sins, they need no longer have any fear of Satan, but may come boldly before him, triumph over him, and mock at him, in contrast with the delusion of the Egyptians, who thought that they had to do immediately with the evil principle, the Typhon. Here also the symbol is a type. By the symbol the triumph of the church of God over Satan is shown to be necessary in accordance with its essence; and since this triumph was but imperfect under the Old Testament, the yearly feast of atonement was at the same time a pledge of a more complete triumph to be granted in the future, having its foundation in atonement through the true High Priest; comp. Heb. vii. 26, ix. 7, and Zech. iii. 8—a passage which shows that the incompleteness of the Levitical atonement was already recognised under the Old Testament. And, apart from its ascetic meaning,

the outward rest of the Sabbath formed a symbol of the inner, actual rest: Thou shalt cease from thy work, that God may have His work in thee, as Isaiah interprets the symbolical action. But every command is at the same time a promise. In the sphere of revelation there is no "Thou shalt" which is not followed by "Thou wilt." The external rest of the Sabbath was therefore a type of that rest which God would at a future time grant to His people from all their own works, comp. Heb. iv. 9. Again, fasting was a symbolical representation of repentance. Man, in chastising his soul (this is the expression which the law applies to fasting), by this means made an actual confession that misery belonged to him. God, in commanding this symbolical expression of repentance, required repentance from the covenant-people, treated it as presupposed in the symbol, and in it gave an actual promise that, at a future time, He would pour out the spirit of repentance and of grace in rich abundance upon the nation, comp. Zech. xii. 10. Finally, the sin-offerings were symbolical. In them the offerer made a virtual confession that he recognised himself as a miserable and condemned sinner, deserving the fate of the sacrificed animal, and that he placed his trust only in the acceptance of substitution by the divine mercy. And because God instituted sin-offerings, they also were symbolical. They contained the virtual assurance that at a future time God would institute a more perfect redemption, a true substitution, which was only prefigured and typified in the offering of animals, but could not be fully bestowed. Isaiah, chap. liii., already regards sin-offering as such an actual assurance. And so throughout.

But now the question arises, whether, in the ceremonial law, there is not at best useless circumlocution—the question why God chose this material representation of spiritual truths, why He did not represent them naked and bare, in mere words?

1. Here we must, first of all, apprehend the symbolical tendency of the East generally, and of antiquity in particular. The image and symbol were a means of bringing home to the people that truth which they were not yet able to comprehend without a veil. The language of symbol was at that time the natural language. And we find the same plan pursued in the New Testament. The design is not merely to fill the mind with true thoughts, but also to sanctify the phantasy, and to

fill it with holy images. For this the profound allegory of the ceremonial law forms an excellent means. Whoever has penetrated into this cannot fail to regard the lower as a type of the higher. We are released from the external representation; it is too coarse, too material for the New Testament times. The symbolism may still, however, serve as an image for us.

2. The ceremonial law, in placing the least and the greatest in outward connection with God, in bringing God into everything, formed a life-long remembrance of the inner relation to Him. Take, for example, the laws respecting food, which cannot be regarded as arbitrary enactments, but rather rest upon the symbolical character of Nature, and are images of that which is morally clean and unclean. Every act of eating and drinking was calculated to recall God to the memory of those who were by nature so apt to forget Him. In this respect the ceremonial law had deep meaning, especially as an antidote to the Egyptian nature. False religion had taken possession of the Egyptian mind principally through the circumstance that it had penetrated by its ceremonies into every corner of the national life. Adherence to it could only be thoroughly removed by a homœopathic mode of dealing. Otherwise the true religion would have remained hovering above the actual relations, instead of permeating them.

3. The ceremonial law was designed to effect the separation of Israel from other nations, comp. Eph. ii. 14. Idolatry was then the spirit of the age; nor was this spirit of the age something accidental, but in the state of things then existing was, even in its form, a necessary product of that same human nature which was possessed by Israel also. The sole means of inwardly resisting it, the Holy Spirit, was not present among Israel in the masses; and apart from the Holy Spirit no adequate effect could be anticipated. Thus the Israelites were kept outwardly under the law to Christ, until the time when, furnished with power from on high, they could begin the offensive warfare against heathendom.

4. The ceremonial law facilitated the recognition of sin, and thus called forth the necessity for redemption. The people must be weary and heavy laden, that at a future time the Lord might be able to say to them, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." The

law was, and was intended to be, a hard yoke, Acts xv. 10, Gal. v. 1, under which the nation should sigh, and thus be stirred up to long for the Redeemer.

5. Much in the ceremonial law served, by carnal impress, to awaken in the carnal people reverence for that which was holy. This aim is definitely expressed in Ex. xxviii. 2. The ceremonial law made it very difficult to have intercourse with the heathen. Some of the forbidden animals, for example, were those which other nations were commonly in the habit of eating; comp. Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, Th. 4, § 203. Add to this that mockery of the heathen, which had its origin in the observance of the canonical law, and which we still find expressed in Greek and Roman authors.

And here we must allude to the subject of a long and violent dispute among older theologians. English scholars—Marsham in the *Canon chronicus aegypt., ebraic., graec.*; Spencer, *de leg. rit.*; Warburton, in *The Divine Legation of Moses*, to whom Clericus, and, to some extent, J. D. Michaelis, attached themselves—sought to prove that among the oldest heathen nations, especially among the Egyptians, there were similar ceremonies, and on this hypothesis found the assumption that God had connected with the true religion customs which had been prevalent among idolatrous nations, in order, by this condescension, to help the weakness of the Israelites, who had become accustomed to these ceremonies while in Egypt. Their opponents, on the other hand, maintained, first, that it would be unworthy of God to pay any regard to those customs prevalent among idolatrous nations; or, in their language, for the devil to have supplied God the Lord with matter for the ceremonial law, since otherwise the devil would be *simia Dei*, but God not *simia diaboli*; second, that the similarity is by no means so great; and finally, that where such similarity can be proved, the Egyptians may readily have borrowed from the Israelites; for we have no account of their religious constitution, except in very late writings. The principal work on the subject is Witsius' *Aegyptiaca*, Amstel. 1683; Lange, *Mos. Licht und Recht*; and Pfaff, in the preface to his edition of Spencer. It cannot be denied that these theologians were right in taking up the matter very seriously: for if the view of the English scholars were allowed, it would

prove the rude transfer of a whole multitude of the elements of the heathen religion; and in this case would it not be much more natural to leave out God entirely, and to assume that the borrowing originated with the Israelites themselves? And the English critics were not able so completely to escape this conclusion, if they refrained from giving it outward expression. In Marsham, at least, we have many reasons for supposing that his view of the Old Testament was pretty much that of the rationalists, who afterwards understood well how to employ the results of the English theologians for their own purposes. In Spencer, also, the fundamental direction is plainly rationalistic. Yet we must not overlook the fact, that the opposition to this view, although in the main well-founded, was yet in one respect partial. The truth that lay at the basis of their assertions was overlooked, and by this very means many were led to adopt their errors. Although the English scholars dragged forward a multitude of similarities, although they showed no critical power in the use of sources, although they brought forward very much which, owing to its universal character, can prove nothing at all; yet notwithstanding the opposition against them, which has been recently revived by Bähr, there still remains something which must lead us to accept an inner link of connection between the heathen and the Israelitish religions,—for example, the Egyptian analogy of the Urim and Thummim, the cherubim, and the rite at the feast of atonement. This rite presupposes the Typhonia Sacra of the Egyptians, which cannot be doubted if we compare those passages of the ancients which have reference to it, collected by Schmidt, *de Sacerd. et Sacrif. Aeg.* S. 312 ff.; and the discussions in the work entitled *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, p. 164 ff. But notwithstanding the similarity in form (the offering of the Typhon was also led into the wilderness), there is a most decided contrast as regards the meaning. Among the Egyptians Typhon is conciliated,—among the Israelites only God: the goat sent to Azazel in the wilderness is first consecrated to God as a sin-offering. The inability to rise to a perception of the internal differences between those things which are outwardly similar—theological impotence—is the great defect in these English scholars. But their opponents also participated in this defect to some extent. If they had vividly realized that the soul

is more than the body, they would not have been so anxious to set aside all outward agreement. It must be said, however, that the most unprejudiced examination can find comparatively few points of contact with Egyptian worship. The three already mentioned are the most important. Besides these, we must refer to the institution of holy women, Ex. xxxviii. 8—women who renounced the world in order to consecrate themselves entirely to the service of God in prayer and fasting, in the tabernacle of the covenant; an institution *a priori* probably due to an Egyptian source, since it was not instituted by Moses, but arose of itself, and is placed beyond all doubt by the precise accounts concerning the holy women among the Egyptians. Women from the higher families, princesses, even queens, in Egypt consecrated themselves to some deity. The most important were the Pallades of Amon: comp. Bähr on *Herod.* ii. 54, pp. 557, 612; Wilkinson, i. p. 258 ff.; Rosell. i. 1, p. 216 ff. But we see at once how essentially different the outwardly similar institution was among the Israelites, if we only apprehend the difference between the God of Israel and the Egyptian deities. The form of the Nazirate seems also to have an Egyptian origin, as also the laws relative to the material and colour of the priests' garments, and the legislation respecting clean and unclean animals, and a few other things.

The result is the following: It is impossible without embarrassment to deny a close connection between the Egyptian and the Israelitish worship, since in many places we find an agreement which is too characteristic to pass for accidental. A borrowing on the side of the Egyptian can hardly be thought of. But just as little can we suppose that the Israelites properly borrowed from the Egyptians. The state of the matter is this. Every sensuous worship, every external religion, rests upon the distinction between holy and unholy. Now the holy is partly natural—resting upon an inner relation of the symbol to the thing symbolized; as, for example, anointing, common among nations the most diverse, and quite independent of each other, was a symbol of consecration, washing was a symbol of purification, the slaughter of sacrificial animals was a symbolical expression of the necessity for atonement. Again, the holy is factitious, either entirely or to some extent, so that the meaning, though attached to a natural symbol, goes beyond it. But the

artificial symbol does not for the most part originate by some one stepping forward, and saying, "This thing which has hitherto always been regarded as common, shall from this time be holy, and shall mean this and that." In a certain sense it is a natural product. It leaves the circle of common things gradually, by various circumstances, historical associations which attach themselves to it, etc. And when for a long time it has been the habit to regard such an artificial symbol as a representation of the supersensuous, then the distinction between it and the natural disappears. It makes the same impression as the natural, and therefore presents a point of contact which the original, common thing did not possess. Hence, only the foundation of that which had already been consecrated in this way was transferred to the Israelitish religion as a symbol of the holy, but this transference, if we may call it so, has reference only to the form; with regard to the spirit, which is the main point, the contrast is most decided. At the conclusion of this section we only remark further, that the locality of the giving of the law has not received its true elucidation until our time. It has frequently been maintained (recently by Winer, in his article Sinai, in the first edition of the *Real-Wörterbuch*) that there was no open space between Mount Horeb and the plain where Israel assembled at the command of God for the giving of the law. The contrary is now firmly established.

Robinson tried to prove that the plain er-Rahah, lying north of Mount Sinai, was suitable as an encampment for the children of Israel. But the difficulty still remained, that from that point the summit of the present Sinai must have been completely concealed from the view of the people, contrary to the Mosaic narrative; a difficulty which Robinson seeks to obviate by the forced hypothesis that tradition is at fault in its determination of the position of Mount Sinai. But further examination has ascertained that the large plain lying north of Sinai was not the only one adapted to the encampment of a nation, but that there is one equally large on the south side of Sinai, and that from this great southern plain, called Sebaijah, the summit of the lofty Sinai of tradition, which rose like a pyramid immediately towards the north, was fully visible to the people. Compare the collection of researches by Laborde, Tischendorf, Strauss, and others, in Ritter. "This plain," says Tischen-

dorf, "is of great extent, and seems as if made to be the scene of such a solemn act." It also forms an excellent commentary on the expression employed by Moses in Ex. xix. 22: "Who-soever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death." For in the plain of Sebaijah the mountain may be actually touched, since it rises up so precipitously that it can be seen in all its grandeur from the foot to the summit. It also agrees with the words, "And they stood at the nether part of the mount," ver. 17. Seldom is it possible to stand so immediately at the foot of a mountain with the glance fixed on the summit many thousand feet high, as in the plain of Sebaijah, at the foot of Sinai.

§ 6.

OTHER OCCURRENCES ON SINAI.

After the conclusion of the covenant, as a confirmation of it, the God of Israel manifested Himself gloriously to the nation in His representative, Ex. xxiv. 9-11, exemplifying the words, "The pure in heart shall see God," and proving that He reveals Himself to all those who keep His commandments, John xiv. 21. We must remember that the elders were in a solemnly elevated frame of mind, that they were rapt in God, as the apostles at the feast of the passover. That which was seen under the feet of God ("And there was under His feet as it were a paved work of sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness") reflected the majesty and glory of the divine acts and judgments. The clear splendour (the white, *i.e.* the dazzling sapphire) points to their exceeding glory; the purity, to their absolute faultlessness. Above this splendour God appeared, as Jerome says, "in human form, and in the likeness of a glorious prince and lawgiver." This formed the consummation of the solemn conclusion of the covenant, in prefiguration of the *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*.

After this consummation Moses repaired to the mount, at the command of God, and was on the mount 40 days and 40 nights. This number 40 leads us to suspect that more happened than the giving of the tables of the law, and the communication of directions respecting the erection of the tabernacle

of the covenant, and the preparation and arrangement of everything pertaining to it, as they were given by God during this sojourn of Moses, Ex. xxv. 31. If we assume that the vow of the people to keep the covenant was sincere, the next thing which God had to do, in accordance with the covenant concluded, was to make His dwelling among the people, the King among His subjects. But that which served to prepare for the realization of this incumbency on the part of God, served at the same time to show in how far this assumption was correct, and helped to reveal the infidelity of the people, and in this way to show them how necessary it was to lay a better foundation.

These 40 days are a compendium of the 40 years' march through the wilderness. In them is concentrated the essence of these 40 years, which are related to them as the legislation on Sinai is related to all the other manifestations of God which took place during the whole period. The most vivid revelation is followed by the strongest temptation—the external must always be regarded as having a connection with the analogous internal.

Mention is frequently made of a mythical number 40 in the Bible. But how remarkable it is that whenever this number appears in an important aspect, the kernel of the events is invariably the same! And to this the similarity in number points as a mark. The 40 years of Moses in Midian, the 40 years of Israel in the wilderness, the 40 years of Moses' absence after the giving of the law, the 40 days spent by Elias on the journey to Horeb, the 40 days that the Saviour dwelt in the wilderness—such a coincidence is certainly not accidental. There is also an unmistakeable significance in number elsewhere in Scripture: as 40 is the symbol of temptation, so 7 is the signature of the covenant, 12 the signature of the covenant-nation, 3 the number of blessing, 4 the signature of the earth. But we must not attribute the significance to the number in and for itself, as Bähr does, but must search into its deep mysteries. In itself the number is meaningless, and acquires its significance only through facts which attach themselves to it in some way or other. The number 12 is in itself no more adapted to be the signature of the covenant-nation, though still retained as such in the New Testament (comp. Matt.), than any other. It was first raised to this dignity by the circumstance that Jacob had just 12 sons, the ancestors of Israel, properly 13 after the adop-

tion of Ephraim and Manasseh; but only 12 are counted, because in ancient times the number 12 had acquired so much importance, by reason of the 12 signs of the zodiac and the 12 months, that the division of nations was regulated according to it, where this was possible without great difficulty. The number 7 acquired its significance and holiness from the perception that important natural relations were determined by it, and the Israelites adopted this significance without consideration of its grounds. Seven became the number of the oath and covenant, because the Israelites regarded them as most holy, and the number 7, being holy to their neighbours, seemed specially adapted to symbolize them; but in itself the number 7 has no connection whatever with oath and covenant. The number 3 became the signature of blessing by the circumstance that the Mosaic blessing, Num. vi. 22 ff., was governed by 3. *Four* became the signature of earth on account of the four quarters of the heavens. So also it is to the fact of Moses' 40 years' residence in Midian that this number owes its consecration as the number of trial and temptation. If this be kept in mind, we shall be guarded against seeing more in the numbers than signs which outwardly connect that which is internally similar, and there will be no temptation to enter into trifles, after the example of Bähr and Kurtz, which can only serve to obscure that which is really true in the matter. With regard to the number 10 there is certainly a connection between the meaning and the character of the number; among Israel, as well as among other nations, it was a mark of completeness, a significance determined more by the fact that 10 was the number of the commands of the fundamental law than by anything else. Even in the Pentateuch, apart from the Decalogue, it appears as a means of union for a complex of similar things.

But the temptation for the covenant-nation also involved a temptation for the covenant-mediator, and this must be well apprehended for the understanding of the whole event. The design plainly appears in Ex. xxxii. 10, when, after the great sin of the people, God addresses the interceding Moses in these words: "Let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them; and I will make of thee a great nation." The mediator of the covenant is tempted in that very thing in which the essence of his office consisted; and

the temptation was the more severe since the selfishness, which seeks only its own, had here so plausible a pretext in the apparently incorrigible obstinacy of the nation. Israel does not withstand temptation. God disappears from visible and sensible proximity. They no longer see His messenger, nor the visible symbol of God's presence, which had followed him to the mountain. They cannot bear that God should disappear from the region of their five senses. Instead of quietly waiting, they think it necessary to bring Him down again with their own hand, until He again condescends to their weakness. Like the weak in faith at all times, they will have a palpable God at any price. It is quite clear that idolatry proper is not the question at issue. Among other passages, this appears from Ex. xxxii. 5. But the worship of symbols is the first step towards idolatry. It was most strictly forbidden in the fundamental law which had just been given. The prohibition, which is clearly shown by this prelude—which cannot refer to actual idolatry—to be distinct from the command respecting idolatry proper, though the Lutheran Church has overlooked the distinction, must be regarded as a sharp declaration of war against the Egyptian religion, in which the worship of images occupied so prominent a place. It rests upon the deep recognition of God's holiness—*i.e.* of His absolute exaltation above all created things—according to which nothing created can be a worthy means of representation and an adequate symbol of God. It is not directed against the making of images, in itself, or generally, as the Reformed Church erroneously supposed, but only against that misconception which, in the heathen confusion of earthly and super-earthly, regards the symbol as a surrogate and equivalent of its object, and hence honours and worships it. In the Decalogue, "Thou shalt not make" is immediately followed by "Thou shalt not worship." That the symbol here mentioned was of this kind, appears from Ex. xxxii. 1, where the people say to Aaron, "Make us gods, which shall go before us;" and again, from ver. 4, when, after the molten calf is ready, they say, "These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." There is but a step from the worship of images to idolatry. This act must therefore be characterized as a violation of the covenant. The fundamental law was broken. And further, we must take into consideration by what

image the Israelites represented God. They borrowed the form from the Egyptians, with whom the bull was the symbol of the power of nature. For a natural religion, such as the Egyptian, this symbol was most appropriate, but it could not represent the Israelitish idea of God, in which God's holiness was predominant. By the choice of this symbol, therefore, the nation showed that its religious consciousness was not yet strictly separated from that of the heathen. It needed but a small occasion, and the boundaries which had arisen in moments of inspiration fell away again. If God had now chosen to exercise His right, it would have been all over for Israel; for the *παρεχτὸς λόγου πορνείας*, which holds good of earthly marriage, applies also to its heavenly prototype. But God does not always exercise this right, giving us a pattern by which to regulate human relations. He only asserts it absolutely where He finds stubborn obduracy. Here He first conceals every other aspect of His nature except justice, but only that mercy may again find an object in the repentant and contrite people. They must be terrified by severity, which was not feigned, but had its foundation in the nature of God, and must be led to a recognition of the greatness of their transgression. This severity was an interpretation of the fearful manifestations which accompanied the giving of the law, Ex. xix. 16, xx. 15; the meaning of which is thus explained in Ex. xx. 20: "That His fear may be before your faces, that ye sin not." Their heart was to be filled with holy awe of the heavenly Judge, who would severely punish the infringement of His laws.

Aaron's conduct in the matter at first sight appears problematical. But the difficulty disappears by the following remark: Aaron in no wise consented to the demand of the people; he was firmly convinced that God would again reveal Himself in His own time, and that Moses would return; he knew that the desire of the nation was sinful—a violation of the divine law. This appears from his answer to Moses, Ex. xxxii. 22, "Let not the anger of my lord wax hot: thou knowest the people, that they are set on mischief." But in a perplexity which had its origin in weakness of faith, he thought it necessary to permit the lesser evil in order to ward off the greater. Instead of doing his best, and leaving the result to God, which living faith always does, even if everything must be lost from

a human point of view, he thought it incumbent on him to yield to the demand of the people, lest, left to themselves, they should fall from the worship of images into open idolatry. On every hand his reason supplied him with excuses. The Lord had indeed forbidden the worship of images; but the nation was not yet ripe: it must first be emancipated from the material, the reality must be taken as it is, etc. He made, however, one attempt to do away with the whole thing. He required that the people should give him all their gold rings. But the result was the same which generally follows the attempt to drive out sin by sin. The false enthusiasm was for the moment more powerful than avarice. Therefore he submitted to the apparent necessity.

The complete fall of the nation, the half fall of Aaron, allows the perfect victory of Moses to appear in the more glorious light. It consists in his deep horror of sin, which manifested itself outwardly in his casting down the tables of the law—the greatness of this horror forms the criterion of his own greater or less estrangement from sin—and in the firmness with which, notwithstanding his deep apprehension of sin and of divine justice, he yet takes hold on the divine mercy, and refuses to leave God until He bless the people; and again in his self-denying love for his people, which led him to pay little regard to all that was offered for himself personally, and found expression in the declaration that he would live and die with the people.

Moses was rewarded for the contest by being permitted to see God; a revelation distinct only in form from that vouchsafed to all those who are pure in heart, especially after every successfully resisted struggle, which always ends in our gaining a deeper insight into the divine glory. When Moses asked for this, he was answered that human weakness cannot bear a perfect view of the divine glory; but this weakness did not prevent God showing him as much as it was possible for man to comprehend. Together with the vision, a revelation of God is given in words, Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7, where in a few sharp strokes His nature is delineated as it was revealed through centuries, so that what is description must at the same time be regarded as prophecy. Prominence is here given principally to the moral qualities, as forming the centre of Jehovah's essence; those which had most completely disappeared from the heathen con-

sciousness : first His infinite mercy and grace, and then, lest advantage should be taken of His grace, His inexorable punitive justice : “The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children’s children, unto the third and to the fourth generation.”

The splendour which shone in the countenance of Moses when he came down from the mountain was a reflection of his inner glory, an external attestation to his victory, a preliminary fulfilment of the saying, “They that be teachers shall shine as the brightness of the firmament,” and at the same time a testimony to that which had passed between God and him alone; finally, a type of the transfiguration of Christ, with which it has this aim in common, viz. to present the Mediator of the divine revelations to the community in His true light. The fact that Moses was obliged to cover his face with a veil because the people were unable to bear the heavenly splendour which shone from him, Ex. xxxiv. 30 ff., although this splendour was only a temporary and lower one, not to be compared with the glory of Christ, was a sign of the low standpoint of the church of the Old Testament, whose eyes were still so weak that it could not even look at the weak reflection of the spiritual Sun without being blinded; and since the low can never be the ultimate in the sphere of revelation, was also an indication of a more complete economy which would have power to make it possible to see the glory of the Lord with uncovered face. Moses, with the veil over his face (the covering which was assumed for the sake of this people, belongs in reality to them), is the symbol of the old covenant-people in contrast with the people of the new covenant. The veil is taken away only in Christ, and still remains for those who do not recognise Him. The Lord, whose face they cannot look upon, is concealed from them, His revelation is hidden; comp. 2 Cor. iii. 7–18.

Before leaving this subject we have to refute an objection which has been brought against Moses, viz. that at his command those Levites who had remained faithful to the Lord were obliged to slay the principal leaders of the apostasy.

The reproach cannot be limited to this transaction alone; it can only be regarded as an efflux of the principle which prevades the whole law. Idolatry and everything connected with it, the worship of images, the transference of heathen ceremonies into the worship of the true God, astrology, soothsaying, false prophecy, all this is treated as punishable crime. Idolatry was punished by stoning. If a whole town had become guilty of it, then all the inhabitants, and even the cattle, were to be slain; no booty was to be taken, but everything was to be burnt with the city, which was never to be rebuilt, Deut. xvii. 2-5, chap. xiii. If this law were not carried into effect, God took the punishment into His own hands, which then consisted in war, or famine, and other calamities affecting the country, and ended at last with the nation being carried away into captivity. Lev. xxvi., Deut. xxix.; John Dav. Mich., *Mos. Recht*, Th. 5, § 248.

Without doubt, this whole side of the legislation points distinctly to the fact that the old covenant cannot be the end of the ways of God. We may concede that the treatment prescribed by the law for those who erred in religious matters had an element of roughness in it. The prevalence of such external measures to guard against the spread of infection presupposes a weakness of the spirit, and points to a time when, by a more abundant outpouring of the Spirit, the church of God will receive power to conquer error and false belief in an internal way. As soon as this outpouring took place the whole position towards offenders was altered, but we have no reason for supposing that the New Testament contains disapproval of the Old Testament maxims in this respect. In Luke ix. 55 the Lord answers His disciples, who wish to call down fire from heaven after the example of Elias, not by telling them Elias did wrong, but by reminding them that they were children of another spirit, that it would be an anachronism for them to wish to do what was good under the old covenant. In the Old Testament these ordinances and measures were good, but under the New Testament they would be bad. The times have altered, and the Romish Church, to its great shame, has misapprehended this alteration of times. But in the temporal element of these laws the eternal must not be overlooked. This consists in the fact that they point to the fearful guilt

incurred in apostasy from God. Temporal punishments have ceased under the New Testament, but that which was prescribed in reference to them is a prophecy of the eternal judgments of God, comp. Heb. x. 26 ff., xii. 18 ff. Those judgments are not abolished under the New Testament, but only retarded; because in delay there is less danger and more hope of amendment. The commandments, as such, have disappeared, but they have transformed themselves into prophecies of still more terrible punishments. Bodily death has been supplanted by the other death, Apoc. xx. 6, 14. The abrogation of the law and the increased severity of the punishment rest upon the same foundation.

On his first sojourn on the mountain, Moses had received directions respecting the sanctuary and everything connected with it. On his first descent there could be no mention of the carrying out of these directions. The covenant was broken. Moses expressed this by his symbolical act of breaking the tables of the covenant, and the Lord would not dwell among this people. But now when the covenant, with its conditions and promises, is renewed, Moses makes known what God had then commanded, and the realization begins. The people prove their better disposition by the joyfulness with which they present freewill offerings for the erection of the tabernacle of the covenant. The sanctuary is consecrated, and, when the people have done all that devolves upon them, God does His part also. He enters into His dwelling. The cloud covers the tabernacle, and the place is filled with the glory of the Lord. Exodus concludes with this account. From this time the holy tent became the centre of the nation, the heart of its existence. This is therefore the place to make a few remarks about it, for which we refer to the details and establishment in Part iii. of the *Beiträge*. The fact that the sanctuary was originally portable, a tent-temple, is an actual testimony to the truth of the Pentateuch narrative, that the original institution of the religion of Israel took place during the time of their wandering life; for it is founded on the presupposition that the whole nation at that time dwelt in tents. To these tents the sanctuary bore the same relation as the tent of the commander to the whole encampment. Again, this tent proves that the event by which the nation, when on the point of

entering Canaan, was driven back for thirty-eight years into the wilderness, was not unexpected by Moses, and that a long time of preliminary trial and education in the wilderness was calculated upon; for the wilderness offered means of education which did not exist in Canaan. A structure so troublesome and costly would scarcely have been undertaken for a period of days.

The name of the tabernacle reveals its meaning. It is called אהל מועד, "tent of assembling." According to this, it is the place where God and His people come together, and also the symbol of the kingdom of God under the old covenant, the embodiment of His communion with Israel. The relation was essentially a spiritual one, which might have existed without the tabernacle of the covenant, since it was earlier—the latter being a name which rests only on a somewhat inaccurate translation of אהל by Luther. He follows the Vulgate, which in many passages renders the word by *tabernaculum foederis*: covenant in the sense of agreement. But what was not demanded by the nature of the thing was required by the weakness of the people, who needed a sensuous form of the spiritual relationship. The holy tabernacle was divided into two parts, according to its occupants: the first belonged to God, the Holy of holies; the second to the people. It was necessary to have two subdivisions in the part belonging to the people, owing to the circumstance that the nation still required a mediation of priests as their representatives. It was therefore divided into the sanctuary, which could only be entered by the nation through its mediators, and thus became the ideal dwelling-place of the people; and the fore-court, their actual dwelling-place. According to Bähr (*Temple of Solomon*, 1848), the whole tabernacle of the covenant, including the Holy of holies and the Holy place, was the habitation of God alone, the curtain serving only to conceal the ark of the covenant. But in this case the holy tabernacle would be incorrectly termed "the tent of assembling;" and what Bähr brings forward in favour of his theory, viz. that the whole tabernacle is always spoken of as the habitation of God in the midst of Israel, proves nothing. For it is self-evident that both parties do not dwell in the tabernacle of the covenant with equal right, and that God receives His people as guests in the tabernacle. But, from Bähr's point of view, not only is the name אהל מועד unintel-

ligible, but also those passages in the Psalms and elsewhere which represent the pious as the household of God : comp. Ps. xv. ; Matt. xxiii. 38 ; Eph. ii. 19.

The vessels of the sanctuary are so distributed that those found in the dwelling of God represent the relation of God to the nation, while those in the dwelling of the people represent the relation of the people to God ; the vessels employed by the priests in their offerings for the nation stood in the sanctuary, and the vessel which involved direct activity on the part of the people (the altar of burnt-offering) stood in the fore-court.

The Holy of holies contained a vessel composed of three significant parts, viz. the ark of the covenant. The three parts are,—1. עֲרֹוֹת : the tables of the law, which lay in the ark of the covenant, are thus designated ; 2. כַּפֹּרֶת, mercy-seat, the name given to the covering of the ark of the covenant (comp. the vindication of the meaning atonement, or vessel of atonement, in Bähr and in the *Beiträge* ; V. Hofmann, *Prophecy and Fulfilment*, has urged nothing of any weight against it, and has since been refuted by Delitzsch) ; and 3. כְּרוּבִים. These are the personified, earthly, living creation ; the throne of God between them pointing to the fact that the sublunary world, with all its powers, is subject to Him and serves Him. The God of Hosts corresponds to this designation, for it refers just as exclusively to His dominion over the heavenly powers, as does this to His dominion over earthly powers. On the cherubim, comp. Bähr's *Symbolism of the Mosaic Worship*, i. p. 341 ff. ; his only error is in making the cherub the personification of creation generally, instead of the living, earthly creation. The latter view alone enables us to understand the four faces of the cherubim in Ezek. chap. i., the man, the lion as representative of wild animals, the bull as representative of cattle, the eagle as representative of birds. In this way the three parts are more closely related to each other. The testimony is laid in the ark of the covenant. Above the testimony is the mercy-seat. Above the mercy-seat rise the two cherubim, in close connection with it ; a connection represented by the circumstance that they consist of the same divine mass of which the mercy-seat is formed, and grow as it were out of it. The cherubim stand at the two ends of the mercy-seat. Their faces are towards one another. They look down upon the

mercy-seat, and with their outstretched wings they cover it. Above the cherubim the Lord is enthroned. The interpretation is this: the foundation of God's covenant with Israel is the testimony, the revelation of the will of God. If they are faithful in this privilege, if they endeavour to fulfil the commandments with all their heart, then they have in the mercy-seat the pledge of the forgiveness of their sins of weakness. This is the second great benefit, and a third grows out of it. Out of the mercy-seat springs the protection of the cherubim, who look down with friendly faces on the mercy-seat and the reconciled nation, and cover them with their protecting wings. If the people of God have only Him for their friend, all creation bears a friendly relation to them. The three vessels of the sanctuary indicate that the people of the Lord are to be a people of prayer, of light, and of good works. First the altar of incense. The burning of sweet, fragrant incense is in Holy Scripture the symbol of prayer, Ps. cxli. 2; Apoc. v. 8, viii. 3, 4; Luke i. 10. Then the candlesticks, signifying that the people of God were the light of the world, and demanding that they should let this light shine, comp. Zech. iv.; Rev. i. 20. Finally, the table of shew-bread, covered with bread and wine, as a symbol of the spiritual nourishment of good works which Israel should present to their heavenly King.

Leviticus begins, chap. i.-vii., with the laws relating to sacrifices. This, therefore, is the place for an examination of the sacrifices of the Mosaic economy.

The foundation of sacrifice lies in the idea that a mere passive relation towards God does not become man who is created in His image; that, left to himself, he sinks down to the level of the beast which consumes the gifts of God in stolid indifference, having power to take, but none to give.

The universal and comprehensive name for sacrifice is קרבן, to which הקריב corresponds for the administration of sacrifice. The generic idea of sacrifice must be given in this comprehensive name. The explanation cannot admit of doubt. הקריב means *attulit*, *obtulit donum*, and is used also of gifts which are not presented to God, for example Ps. lxxii. 10, Judg. v. 25. Therefore קרבן can only mean offering, gift.

In accordance with this comprehensive designation of offering, it includes everything rendered to God, all that man has to do

in relation to Him, the whole service of God. We arrive at the same result from another aspect. Sacrifice is a necessary product of the symbolic spirit of antiquity. But, as the form of religious consciousness necessary at that time, it did not confine itself to a single part of religious activity, but covered it on all sides. Since, however, religious activity is manifold, and moves in circles the most various, which have their point of union only in the most universal, we must consecrate ourselves to God, offer atonement to Him for our sins, petitions in our distress, gratitude for His salvation, and show diligence in good works,—so that the idea of sacrifice must be universal throughout.

With regard to the distribution of sacrifices, they are divided into those which have for their object the restoration of a state of grace, and those presented by persons who are already in a state of grace. The first class consists of sin- and trespass-offerings, the second of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings to which bloodless sacrifices are attached.

We have already remarked that sin-offerings did not originate until the time of the Mosaic economy, that at the time of the patriarchs consciousness of sin was not developed to such a degree as to require an independent expression. The first question which arises here is, what meaning was attached to the Mosaic sin-offering, viz. if it were substitution, and in what sense? The vicarious meaning of sacrifice has been accepted by ecclesiastical theology at all times, and is so prominent that it has also been acknowledged by most rationalistic scholars; and the relation which sacrifice bears to the death of Christ is a strong argument in its favour. If the idea of *satisfactio vicaria* is here demonstrable, and if it is clearly set forth in the Old Testament, in Isa. liii., it cannot be denied in sacrifice, without destroying the relation of type and antitype. In favour of this vicarious meaning we have also the fact, that the flesh of the sin-offering was eaten by the priests in those cases where its blood did not come into the sanctuary; and when the blood came into the sanctuary, as in the case of those sin-offerings which were presented as an atonement for the whole nation including the priests, it was burned without the sanctuary and the camp. Both these circumstances lead to the inference that the uncleanness passed over to the sacrifice, and was absorbed, as it were, by it. This does not,

however, exclude the idea, that from another point of view the sacrifice was most holy. For the uncleanness of the sacrifice is essentially distinct from that of the sinner. With reference to the former—the eating of the flesh of the sin-offering by the priests—Deyling well remarks, in the *Observationes Sacrae*, “Nam hoc facto, cum ederent, incorporabant quasi peccatum populi reatum in se recipiebant, ut indicaretur aliquando sacerdotem et victimam unam fore personam, nempe Messiam, id quod in Jesu Nazareno exacte impletum fuit.” That this view is in the main correct, that the eating of the sacrificial flesh by the priests was an act of religious worship, resting upon the presupposition that the uncleanness of the sinner was transferred, as it were, to the sacrifice, and, that it might be completely put away, must necessarily enter into a closer relation to the priesthood instituted by God, through which relation it was consumed by the holiness imparted to this office,—all this we learn from Lev. x. 17, where Moses says to Aaron, “Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin-offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it to you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord?” And the circumstance that those sin-offerings, in which the priests were themselves included, and therefore could not come forward vicariously, had to be burnt without the camp, is equally significant. Removal without the camp, which represented the church, is in the Mosaic law always a sign of uncleanness. The fact that a clean place had to be chosen without the camp is an argument for the other view of sacrifice. Transferred sin can never be regarded in the same light as indwelling sin. Again, in favour of the transfer we have the fact, that the expression “well-pleasing to God,” which appears so frequently elsewhere, is never used with reference to sin-offering. Finally, we have a proof of imputation in the name given to the sin-offering, חטאת. According to this, sacrifice is looked upon as embodied sin, a mode of consideration peculiar to the vicarious view of sacrifice.

If now it be established that sin-offering has a vicarious meaning, the question arises, in what light are we to regard this substitution? It is quite evident that the sacrifice in itself was by no means adapted to effect what was to be done by its means. The blood of the guilty one must be ransomed by the

blood of an innocent, sinless, righteous, holy One. The sacrifice of an animal may, by its external faultlessness, be well adapted to represent moral faultlessness, but it stands without the sphere of the antithesis of sin and holiness. Moreover, true substitution for sin which arises in the sphere of freedom can only be voluntary, but the sacrifice of animals is compulsory. Finally, there must be a real connection between him who offers the substitution and him for whom it is offered; but this is completely wanting between man and animal. The sacrifice of an animal could therefore only be accepted by God as an equivalent for sin by an acceptilation, to make use of a scholastic expression, *i.e.* a transaction on the part of God which gave the act a meaning it did not possess in itself. On the part of God this acceptilation could only be granted for the sake of the true sin-offering which these typical sin-offerings merely foreshadowed. But the perception of this true sin-offering was only gradually and imperfectly revealed to believers in the Old Testament. It had a twofold object. (1.) To quicken the perception of the enormity and deathfulness of sin. Every one who presented a sin-offering made a virtual confession that by his sin he had deserved death—the most marked contrast to that habit of regarding sin as a bagatelle, a peccadillo, which is so deeply implanted in the natural man, and which the Mosaic law so zealously endeavours to root out. Sin-offerings served as a reminder of sin, Heb. x. 3. (2.) To imbue the nation with the idea of substitution. Hirscher, in his *Moral*, says, “A remarkable idea pervades the worship, viz. this, that no guilt can rest upon itself, none is simply forgiven, but every trespass demands a definite expiation.” In this way the nation was not only taught to regard sin in the most serious light, but the ground was prepared for the acceptance of the true substitution when it should appear in the course of history.

Again, the question arises, for what sins were the sin-offerings presented? Num. xv. 27–31 alone gives a certain clue to the answering of this question. In this passage, which forms the foundation for the New Testament doctrine of the sin against the Holy Ghost, a distinction is made between sins of weakness and wilful sins, *בשגגה* and *ביר רמה*, with a high hand, frank, free, and bold, in the words: “For he hath blasphemed the Lord, despised the word of the Lord, and broken His

commandment." The former may be expiated by sacrifice, but not the latter: *they* are punished by extermination. The region of sin-offering under the Old Testament is therefore in principle as wide as the region of forgiveness.

Among the customs which accompanied the sin-offering, the sprinkling of blood was especially prominent, representing atonement through death, through shedding the blood of the sacrificial animal. This sprinkling of blood appears also in the other sacrifices, for these, too, have an atoning signification. But in them the sprinkling has only a subordinate meaning, because the element of atonement is only subordinate. While in them the blood was only sprinkled round about the altar of burnt-offering, in the sin-offering it was sprinkled principally on the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, in which the whole meaning of the altar culminated—the head of it, as it were. In many cases the blood was brought into the sanctuary itself, where it was sprinkled on the horns of the altar of incense, over against the curtain before the Kapporeth, or even in the Holy of holies, immediately on the Kapporeth. And the act was repeated seven times.

According to Lev. v. the sin-offerings were never to be connected with meat-offerings, which were always associated with peace-offerings alone. The reason is evident as soon as we recognise the meaning of meat-offerings. If these tend to good works, they presuppose complete atonement; for good works can only be performed by those who are already justified. In the same passage it is enjoined that the sin-offering be presented without oil and incense. Oil is spirit. Sin and spirit are mutually exclusive. Before the Spirit can enter in, sin must be expiated. Incense is a symbol of prayer, and prayer presupposes atonement and forgiveness as having previously taken place.

But we have still to treat of the relation of the sin-offering and the trespass-offering. The latter occupies but a subordinate place in the law, and is prescribed only for a limited number of cases. Much light is thrown on its meaning by Num. v. 5 ff., where **אִשָּׁם** is said to mean that which any one has taken from another unjustly, and is bound to restore to him. According to this, **אִשָּׁם** means trespass- and restitution-offering. The sinner must not only be animated by a desire

to obtain God's forgiveness by the atonement of his sins, a desire which is satisfied by the sin-offering, but he must also have a sincere wish to make up for the past as far as possible; a wish which is always a sign of genuine sorrow and repentance. But this wish can receive no real satisfaction in so far as sin has reference to God; and only to this extent has sacrifice to do with sin. Yet, in the Mosaic worship, it had a symbolic representation, as an incentive to sleepy consciences and a satisfaction to anxious ones which cling especially to this point. An estimate was taken of the sin, and an equivalent was presented in the sacrifice, to which the same value was ideally attributed. But since the main object was simply to represent the idea, the trespass- and restitution-offering was only enjoined for a limited number of cases: those which most powerfully suggested the wish to make restitution, especially cases of material faithlessness respecting the property of a master or a neighbour, where the material restitution enjoined could not fail to awaken the wish to be able to satisfy God in a higher sense.

Let us now turn to those sacrifices which were presented by persons already in a state of grace.

Among these, burnt-offerings take the first place. When the sacrifices are named together, the sin-offering always precedes the burnt-offering, and this again precedes the thank-offering. That which is characteristic in the burnt-offering is already indicated by the names it bears. It was called *עלה*, the ascending, that which mounts up in fire to the Lord, and *בלי*, the whole, on account of the total burning, in contrast to the burning of single portions in the other sacrifices, especially in the sacrifice of slaughtered animals. This name makes the total burning just as characteristic of burnt-offerings as the sprinkling of blood was characteristic of sin-offerings. This total burning symbolized consecration to the Lord,—the entire surrender of him who offered the burnt-offering, and in it, himself. The burnt-offering was a sign that he who was justified should henceforward live not to himself but to the Lord, as His true servant. The important place which the burnt-offering occupies is proportioned to this meaning. It recurs in every act of worship as an expression of the disposition which was to be always alive in the church of the

“servants of the Lord.” No man might be without a burnt-offering, and every presentation of another sacrifice was accompanied by a burnt-offering: it came after the sin-offering and before the peace-offering. Further, the burnt-offering was presented every morning and evening, and was to continue burning throughout the whole night, Lev. vi. 2. It was, therefore, the perpetual offering of the people of God, who were thus continually reminded that their life consisted in surrender to the Lord, in being His servants; and that it was their duty to be subservient to all His wishes.

The burnt-offering also had the meaning of atonement, as appears from the express statement in Lev. i. 4. 5, xiv. 20; also from Lev. xvii. 11, where atoning power is attributed to all blood that comes upon the altar; and finally, from the circumstance that in the patriarchal times burnt-offerings still took the place of the sin-offering first instituted in the Mosaic time. He who consecrates himself to the Lord is naturally reminded of his own sinfulness, even if he has just obtained atonement and forgiveness for his sins; and the element of atonement in the burnt-offering was calculated to pacify this remembrance where it was already awakened, and to call forth the thought in those to whom it had not originally suggested itself. Yet in the burnt-offering this element of atonement was throughout subordinate, which appears from the circumstance that it is only expressly mentioned in those passages we have quoted, and that the sprinkling of blood is not in any way emphasized or made prominent as in the sin-offerings, but rather takes place in the most general form: the blood is merely sprinkled round about the altar.

Let us now turn to the peace-offerings, which resemble the burnt-offerings in this respect, that they proceed from a state of grace, or can only be presented by those who are in this state. They bear a twofold name. The one, זבחים, slaughtered sacrifice—the word means an offering in general—points to the fact that the offerer participates in the offering, in contrast to the burnt-offering, which belonged entirely to the Lord. The other, שלמים, goes deeper into the essence of the thing. The name has been variously interpreted, but only one explanation is legitimate. שלם in *Kal*, from which שָׁלַם is derived, has only the one meaning, *integer fuit*, to be com-

pletely safe or sound. Hence שלמים can only mean peace-offerings, in the LXX. σωτήριον. And this is consistent with its application throughout. Everywhere the presentation of the Schelamim stands in connection with salvation. Outram says, *de Sacrificiis*, p. 107: "Sacrificia salutaria in sacris literis Schelamim dicta semper de rebus prosperis fieri solebant, impetratis utique aut impetrandis." That the Schelamim were presented not merely for salvation which was already received, but also with reference to salvation to be received, appears from two reasons. (1.) It is not conceivable that the sacrifice of prayer should be wanting in the Mosaic worship, since petitions occupy so important a place in that relation to God which is intended to be fully represented by sacrifice, as the Psalms already indicate. (2.) The Schelamim are often presented on occasions of sadness, as in Judg. xx. 26, after the Israelites had been conquered; and in xxi. 4, when the tribe of Benjamin had been almost exterminated. Here they cannot refer to the salvation already received, but only to that which was to be received. Yet we must not overlook the fact that the Schelamim, although they served and were intended to serve as an expression of prayer, had originally and throughout the character of thank-offerings. The request was offered in the form of anticipated thanks, as may be seen from a series of passages in the Psalms, comp. for example, Ps. lvi. 13, 14, liv. 8; a form which testifies to the greatness of the trust that was placed in God. Faith is already in possession of the future salvation. Comp. John xi. 41, where Jesus says, before the raising of Lazarus: "Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard me."

With regard to the meaning of the thank-offering, there is an essential distinction between it and the sin-offering and burnt-offering, in so far as it did not, like these, represent the person of the offerer, but only a gift on his part; a peculiarity which was typified by the circumstance that the whole thank-offering did not belong to the Lord, but only single portions of it. This antithesis between it and the burnt- and sin-offerings, is indicated by a peculiar phraseology. עלות and זבחים are frequently connected in such a way that they denote the sum of the sacrifices, including the sin-offering. So, for example, in Lev. xvii. 8, Num. xv. 3, 8, Ezra viii. 35, where the

sin-offerings are expressly reckoned as burnt-offerings. Where Oloth stands in a general sense, we have the contrast between those sacrifices which are dedicated entirely to the Lord and those in which the offerers also participated. The former, the sin-offerings and burnt-offerings, represented the person of the offerer; the latter, a single gift from him. The present, the gift of gratitude, is the usual form of expressing gratitude among men, and this form is transferred to the relation towards God. In the symbolism of worship, gratitude was represented by sacrificial gifts. We learn from many passages that gratitude formed the soul of the thank-offering. But Ps. l. is *instar omnium*. Then comp. Ps. lxxix. 31, 32. This gave rise to the meaning of the laying on of hands in the thank-offering, which denoted in general the *rapport* between the offerer and his offering. In the sin- and burnt-offerings it was a symbolical confession, "Such am I;" in the thank-offering, on the other hand, the symbolic expression was, "Such is my gift, my gratitude." The thank-offering might never immediately succeed a sin-offering. Its necessary basis was always the burnt-offering. Consecration and surrender of the whole person to the Lord must always precede prayer for salvation and subsequent gratitude.

Even in the thank-offering the consciousness of sin found expression, although it was only presented by such as were in a state of grace. Here also the shedding and the sprinkling of blood had an atoning character. The benefits of God invariably awaken a feeling of one's own unworthiness, the feeling which Jacob expresses in Gen. xxxii. 10, "I am not worthy of the least of all the mercies, and of all the truth, which Thou hast shown unto Thy servant." Sinful man cannot express gratitude without humbling himself, without seeking forgiveness for his sinfulness. Yet in the thank-offerings this element was only a subordinate one, as appears from the circumstance that the sprinkling of blood only took place in the most universal form.

The custom of *heaving* and *waving* was peculiar to the thank-offering, הרים and הניף, which was done with the parts which were separated for the officiating priests. This custom pointed to the fact that these parts, no less than those burnt upon the altar, were presented and consecrated to the Lord; that the

priests received them only as servants of the Lord. The ceremony undeniably appears as a symbol of consecration in Num. viii. 11, when it is done at the consecration of the Levites. The heaving points to God as enthroned in heaven; the waving points to Him as the Lord of earth. "Thou compassed my path and my lying down, and art acquainted with all my ways:" Ps. cxxxix. 3.

The time of sacrificial meals was also peculiar to the thank-offerings. This symbolized the fellowship of the offerer with the Lord, who revealed Himself to him in granting salvation, and to whom he revealed himself by his gratitude. But these sacrificial meals were also love-feasts. The giver invited widows, orphans, and poor people, Deut. xii. 18, xvi. 11, and thus made them partakers of his salvation, of his joy, his gratitude, and praise. These sacrificial meals stand in close connection with the command that every Israelite should appear before the Lord at the great feasts. Those who possessed no means were thus enabled to fulfil their religious duty. Bähr and others place the sacrificial meal in a false light when they make Jehovah the host. No trace of this is to be found. The sacrifice, being slaughtered, was not a whole offering, and those parts were eaten which had not been consecrated to the Lord. Its only characteristic is the common participation, the *δειπνήσω μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς μετ' ἐμοῦ*, Rev. iii. 20.

Thus the great allegory of sacrifice which runs through the life of Israel formed a continual exhortation, "Seek the forgiveness of your sins; consecrate yourselves to the Lord, body and soul," Rom. xii. 1, where we have an explanation of the burnt-offering: "Call upon Him in the hour of need, thank Him for His grace." But there is still one element remaining, which is not represented in what we have already discussed, viz. diligence in good works, which is a peculiar mark of the true church of the Lord. According to the *locus classicus* Ps. cxli. 2—comp. my Commentary on the passage—this was represented by the bloodless sacrifice, the *מנחה*, a word which originally signified a gift in general, a present.

These sacrifices are associated with the bloody ones, and never appear independently. They were never connected with sin-offerings, but always with burnt-offerings and thank-offerings. They consisted of bread and wine. In the Old and New

Testaments these are the representatives and symbols of nourishment. Earthly kings were supplied with bodily food by their subjects; the taxes consisted for the most part of products of nature, comp. Gen. xlix. 20, 1 Kings iv. 7. Here, where the King is a spiritual, heavenly one, the bodily nourishment presented to Him can only be a symbol of the spiritual. The petition to God, "Give us this day our bread," and the promise upon which it rests and is established, go side by side with the demand made by God, "Give me my bread this day;" for God never demands without giving, and never gives without demanding. In the Gospel the Lord hungers for the fruit of the fig tree, which symbolizes the Jewish nation; which demand is satisfied when the church is diligent in good works. The connection of the meat-offering with the burnt-offering pointed to the fact that consecration and surrender of the whole person must necessarily precede good works, and that it is equally necessary they should be followed by good works; that Jehovah, the Holy One, is not adequately served by mere feelings of dependence, or even of love, but that He desires zeal in the fulfilling of His commandments; and that the sole proof of complete surrender is this, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you," John xv. 14. The association of the meat-offering with the thank-offering, indicated that true gratitude must prove itself not only in confession, which was represented by the bloody sacrifices, but also in the life: comp. Ps. xl. The shew-bread was a מנחה of the whole church; its name, properly "bread of the face," is explained in Ex. xxv. 30, "And thou shalt set upon the table shew-bread before me alway;" and in Lev. xxiv. 8, "Every Sabbath he shall set it in order before the Lord continually, being taken from the children of Israel by an everlasting covenant." This bread is the offering which the nation brings to its king in God, in fulfilment of the covenant. The interpretation is given in the symbolic act in John xxi., where Jesus gives the disciples the food He had in readiness, and then eats of what the disciples had prepared.

According to Lev. ii. 11 the meat-offering was to be without leaven and honey. Leaven is in Scripture a symbol of corruption. The name given to the unleavened bread, מצות, signifies pure bread; and Paul represents *εὐλακρίνεια* and *ἀλή-*

θεια as corresponding to it in a spiritual sense. By a mixture of leaven the meat-offerings would, therefore, have lost the character of integrity and purity which the symbolical significance demanded. Good works must not be marred by any mixture of impure conduct, or made useless as spiritual food for the holy God. The prohibition of honey, as the favourite food and dainty of all Easterns, especially of the Israelites, indicates that whoever will do good works must not seek the *delicias carnis*. The prohibition of the admixture of salt and oil corresponds with the prohibition of leaven and honey. Salt always appears in Scripture as the seasoning of meat; and another meaning is the less probable in this case, since we have here to do with the meat-offering. Paul gives the interpretation in Col. iv. 6, "Let your speech be alway with grace, seasoned with salt." Salt therefore signifies grace, in contrast with the unsalted, natural disposition. Oil is here, as it always is in Scripture, a symbol of the Spirit of God, by whose assistance alone good works can be performed. A third addition is incense, Lev. ii. 15. In Scripture this is always the symbol of prayer, with which good works must be begun and ended: comp. the classic passage Ps. cxli. 2.

Thus it is shown that among Israel the whole sphere of religion was filled out by sacrifice.

The laws relative to sacrifice are followed by the account of the consecration of the priests, already commanded in Exodus, which presupposes the existence of the institution of sacrifices. Aaron and his sons now enter upon their office. Fire goes out from Jehovah and consumes the first sacrifice. The people exult and worship. It is an actual declaration on the part of God that the worship of the people is pleasing to Him; that the command is also a promise, and at the same time a virtual ratification of the Levitical priesthood. A ratification of another kind follows on the same day. Two sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, die because they ventured to bring strange incense upon the altar of the Lord, in violation of Ex. xxx. 8, 9, 34 ff., probably in drunkenness, to which they had been led by the feast; for we learn that the judgment was immediately followed by a command that the priests, mindful of their exalted calling, should abstain from strong drink. And just as punishments upon the whole nation

were no less a proof of their election than blessings, so it was also with the priestly office. This event at once practically refuted the suspicion that the tribe of Levi owed its elevation to partiality on the part of Moses or of God. It was a prophecy of their whole future fate. Because they remained so far behind their destiny, they never truly enjoyed the privileges which God granted them only on the condition of realizing it. Hence those who might have had the advantage over the other tribes were now at a disadvantage. That is an important statement which the Lord makes to Moses and Moses repeats to Aaron: "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me," Lev. x. 3. Comp. 1 Pet. iv. 17, *Καὶρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and Amos iii. 1 ff. Moses forbade Aaron and his sons to mourn for those who had fallen, because, as the mediators of the nation, they must rise completely to their office; comp. the general injunctions in xxi. 10 ff., according to which the high priest must never unfit himself for his office by solemn mourning for the dead, that by the Mosaic law entailed impurity. The ordinary priest might only mourn for his very nearest relations, who had the first claim to his love, and whom he must therefore bury in a suitable manner; during which time he was divested of his priestly character, Lev. xxi. 1-6. The interpretation of these injunctions was this: "Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead," Matt. viii. 22; the answer with which our Lord met the request, "Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father." The service of the Lord demands unconditional surrender, that a man should say unto his father and to his mother, I have not seen him, and should not acknowledge his brethren, nor know his own children, Deut. xxxiii. 9. If this were required of the servants of God under the economy of the Old Testament, how much more under the New should the servants of God have wife and child as if they had them not! The idea of celibacy is absolutely necessary to the church, and is only transferred to the flesh by the Catholic Church.

This is the proper place to make a few general remarks on the office of the priests and Levites; which is the more necessary since attempts have recently been made to obscure the historical truth regarding them.

In the time of the patriarchs, as we have already seen, there

was no special priestly office. The Mosaic economy, however, demanded such an office. It is but a link in the great chain, and cannot be taken away without breaking it entirely. As a proof that the Mosaic institution met a want which really existed, consider the multiplicity of the ceremonial laws, of which it was only possible for the priests to obtain an accurate knowledge when they were handed down from father to son; the important support afforded to the theocracy by the fact that the temporal interest of a definite order was closely bound up with its existence; the deep-rooted idea that the servants of God possessed, as it were, a hereditary dignity and sanctity, which gave rise to the existence of a priestly caste in almost all ancient nations especially in the East.

The separation of a priestly office is not, however, made a subject of reproach in itself. The objection is rather directed to the manner of the separation, and this in a threefold aspect: 1. That Moses chose his own tribe; 2. The excessive revenue; 3. The inordinate power.

1. If this reproach were just, we should have reason to expect that Moses would first of all have provided for his own sons. We find, however, that they are not considered at all, but are obliged to content themselves with the small portion of the common Levites. The priesthood proper maintains only Aaron and his descendants. Then, again, the choice of the tribe of Levi had the reiterated divine sanction. And that which was powerful enough to overcome the most obstinate scepticism among the Israelites, viz. the burning of the first sacrifice, the death of the sons of Aaron, the budding rod of Aaron, and the destruction of the company of Korah, ought to have as much weight with us as the abstract possibility that Moses here acted from worldly motives; a possibility which cannot even rise to a probability, since Moses narrates the shame of this tribe with the same openness as its honour,—recording the shameful deed of his ancestor, Aaron's great weakness, and the crime of Nadab and Abihu. In other respects, also, he shows himself superior to personal and worldly motives. It is a miserable *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος* to imagine Scripture to be pervaded by this self-seeking. Ex. xxxii. 26-29 shows the reason why the divine choice fell upon the tribe of Levi, comp. Deut. xxxiii. 9. From what is there narrated,

as well as from the act of Phinehas, Num. xxv., it is evident that zeal for the Lord had taken the deepest root among this tribe.

2. The revenues of the Levites certainly appear very considerable at the first glance, even if it be taken into account that the members of the tribe were scattered throughout all Israel, and could only have cities and their immediate environs as a possession, receiving no definite allotment of land, which greatly increased the portions of the other tribes; and that they had to defray the expenses of all public sacrifices. A race consisting of not more than 22,000 males received the tithes of 600,000 Israelites. These were in reality presented to Jehovah, who was regarded as the true landowner from whom Israel had the land as a loan, under conditions whose non-fulfilment would result in the land being taken from them again; and they were constantly reminded of their dependence by the Sabbath and jubilee year, in which the whole land was to lie fallow: comp. Lev. xxv. On the Egyptian foundation of these institutions, comp. *The Books of Moses and Egypt*. As in Egypt the king was the sole landowner, among Israel it was Jehovah, who was intended to be the definite antagonism of a mere abstraction. On the same principle there could be no purchase of land; only the revenue of the land for a certain number of years was saleable. In the year of jubilee everything returned to the old order. And this principle formed the basis of the command to leave the produce of the corners of the fields and the gleanings to the poor, God's clients, as well as that which grew of itself in the sabbatical and jubilee year. The priests, therefore, as God's servants, received the tithes of all Israel. They received also the first-fruits, a portion of the peace-offerings, Lev. vi. and vii., everything that was consecrated, the ransom-money of the first-born, and some other revenues: comp. Num. xviii. 15-32. But consider; the revenues of the Levites were all of such a kind that they depended entirely on the goodwill of the people, which varied according to their piety. If the lawgiver had wished to favour them, he must have endowed them in quite a different way, by the possession of land; and if the management of it seemed not to accord with the dignity of their office, it might have been managed by slaves, or rented after the manner of the Egyptian priests. It cannot be main-

tained that what ensued was unexpected by him, neither can we suppose that he had omitted to take it into account. For he saw and predicted throughout that idolatry would at a future time spread fearfully among the nation, and would at last entail the punishment of captivity. It cannot, therefore, be doubted that he chose this mode of endowment by design. It was part of his plan that the Levites should be in circumstances to suffer want. If the nation remained faithful to the Lord, they had a comfortable competency; and if the nation apostatized from the Lord, their revenues ceased. But such an apostasy presupposes an apostasy of the Levites themselves; a nation always falls through its priests, although the converse is likewise true. The thing was, therefore, so arranged from the beginning that the divine *jus talionis*, as it is strongly expressed by Malachi with reference to this very relation, operates through the relation itself.

If we look at the history, we cannot doubt that the tribe of Levi had outwardly a far less favoured lot than the other tribes. With the exception of a few bright, isolated periods, when they themselves and the nation fulfilled their destination, particularly the times of Joshua and David, it had a melancholy existence. During the long period of the Judges, we cannot expect, from the state of the nation, that their revenues were more than moderate. Scarcely had the Davidic and Solomonic period passed away than the theocratic consciousness decayed, beginning with the priests themselves. On the separation of the kingdom they lost all revenues from the ten tribes; and even from Judah they received only the smaller portion of that which was their due, except in the reigns of the few pious kings. Even in the outwardly God-fearing time of the exile, the priests were often exposed to the greatest want: comp. Mal. iii. 8-12; Neh. xiii. 10-12. Dead orthodoxy could not overpower living selfishness.

3. It is equally easy to refute the objection to the power of the priesthood. A single glance at the history shows its worthlessness. An influence of the priesthood on civil affairs is at no period perceptible in the times of the independent state. And it can easily be proved that what it did not receive, it was not intended to receive in the designs of the lawgiver.

(1.) No direct influence in civil matters is given to the priest-

hood in the Pentateuch, except that they had a certain share in the administration of justice. Rationalism has asserted that the decision of every important question depended upon the high priest through the interrogation of the Urim and Thummim. Let us take this opportunity of entering somewhat more closely into the nature of the Urim and Thummim. As far as the name is concerned, Urim and Thummim can only mean "lux et integritas, δῆλωσις καὶ ἀλήθεια," as the LXX. translate it. The plural is a plural excellentiae, analogous to that in אֱלֹהִים. In Hebrew, the plural frequently denotes intensity of meaning; for example חכמה, wisdom *par excellence*. The name also points to the higher illumination, and the infallible instruction gained through this medium. There are many views as to what constituted the Urim and Thummim. The following is the correct one, which has been defended by Braun, *de vestitu sacerdot.*, Amstel 1682, 2, p. 613 ff., and by Bellermann, *die Urim und Thummim*, Berlin 1824. The proper official robe of the high priest was of three colours,—a splendid garment, richly embroidered with gold, the *ephod*, which bore some similarity to the chasuble of the Romish priests. This dress was attached to the body by means of a scarf embroidered with gold. It was surmounted by a costly-worked vest, חֲשֹׁן or חֲשֹׁן הַמִּשְׁפָּט. In this vest were twelve polished precious stones, set in gold, with the names of the twelve tribes engraved on them. These twelve stones were materially identical with the Urim and Thummim, but formally distinct; *i.e.* the twelve precious stones were not themselves the Urim and Thummim, but only became so by the circumstance that God invested them with the dignity of a symbol: the divine illumination of the high priest was dependent on his wearing them and contemplating them. This formal difference explains why, in Ex. xxviii. 30, which is the principal passage, comp. Lev. vii. 8, after the twelve precious stones have been mentioned, it is said, "And thou shalt put in the breastplate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim; and they shall be upon Aaron's heart when he goeth in before the Lord," as if treating of something new, distinct from the twelve precious stones. On the other hand the following are the arguments for the material identity of the Urim and Thummim with the precious stones:—(1) Moses describes most minutely every part of the high priest's

dress, colour, material, form, and use. If now the Urim and Thummim were materially distinct from the precious stones, we certainly might expect to find a description of this, the most important piece of all. But no such description is to be found. (2) If the Urim and Thummim are materially identical with the precious stones, it is self-evident why, in the detailed and ample description of the priestly dress in Ex. xxxix., the precious stones only are mentioned, and no allusion whatever is made to the Urim and Thummim; while in Lev. viii. 8 only the Urim and Thummim are spoken of, without any reference to the precious stones. (3) The name Urim and Thummim evidently refers to the physical quality of the precious stones. The principal characteristics of precious stones are splendour and solidity. Hence they are well adapted to symbolize divine truth. (4) If the precious stones are at the same time Urim and Thummim, it appears quite fitting that they should be called by the names of the twelve tribes. This pointed to the fact, that the divine revelation was given to the high priest only as the representative of the covenant-nation.

If it be established that the Urim and Thummim were materially identical with the precious stones, there can be no doubt concerning the mode and manner of the revelation by Urim and Thummim. It could only result from an inner illumination of the high priest, which essentially corresponded to the prophetic spirit; but with this difference, that it was associated with an external condition.

As to the use of the Urim and Thummim, according to Num. xxvii. 21, the priest was only to be interrogated by the rulers of the nation in cases of difficulty. There is not a trace in the whole history of revelations spontaneously given by the high priest. All cases which appear in the history show that it was customary to consult the Urim and Thummim only when there was no other resource, where ordinary knowledge did not suffice; not in questions of faith and justice, when they were referred to "the law and the testimony;" comp. Deut. xvii. 9-11, where the written law is expressly pointed out as the sole source for determining all such questions. Nor were they to be consulted in trivial and private matters, but as Carpzov truly says (*Apparatus Hist. Crit.* p. 81), "in causis arduis, de bello et pace, de patria, de rege, de salute populi et reipublicae,

cum velut heroicum esset remedium eruendi occulta, vel resciscendi futura, quo abuti non erat integrum."

With regard to the history of the Urim and Thummim, there is not a single instance of their having been interrogated after the time of David; a circumstance which is easily explained from what we have said in the description of the Urim and Thummim. According to this, everything rested upon the personality, the believing standpoint of the high priest. In the time after David the high priests were deficient in religious depth and inspiration; they became more and more servants of the king. The fact that the Urim and Thummim quite disappear from history is intelligible on the same ground as the circumstance that in the period of the Kings we find the priesthood entirely wanting in penetrating activity. From these remarks on the Urim and Thummim it will be evident in what estimate we are to hold the assertion that through them the priests had the whole guidance of the state in their hands. We saw that the high priest spoke only when he was interrogated. It was left entirely to the priests whether they would ask or not. They were not laid under any obligation to do so, but only the right was given to them. If the priest were not recognised as a man of God, the asking ceased of itself, just as in the times when rationalism predominated, nobody thought of drawing a response from theological faculties; as now when there is an unbelieving preacher, the care for souls ceases of itself. If, in some isolated case, a question was asked, God took care that there should be no answer; and if the high priest were hypocrite enough to give it on his own authority, God put him to shame by the result. From what we have said respecting the occasions on which the Urim and Thummim were interrogated, it follows, therefore, that it was a great risk for the high priest to answer; and those who envy him this privilege would do well earnestly to decline it, if it were offered to them. In all history there is no instance of an attempt to make it subservient to self-interest and priestly assumption. The civil power was first of all in the hands of the rulers, who were not arbitrarily chosen by Moses, but as the chiefs of the nation by birth, were left in possession of their rights; a circumstance which made it appear that the state-power had properly no representatives in Israel, a phenomenon by which

Bertheau (p. 252 ff.) and Ewald have been completely deceived. And it is because Moses here allowed that which had become historical to remain, that the civil rulers are only casually mentioned in the Pentateuch. It is they who appear so frequently under the name of princes and elders, or as those who were called to the assembly, *i.e.* the high council. They were the heads of tribes and of families. Every tribe, with regard to its private affairs, formed a separate whole: each one had its own council and judicial assembly, consisting of the elders: comp. J. D. Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, i. § 45, 46; Jahn, *Bibl. Archäol.* i. § 11. The affairs of the whole nation were discussed at these assemblies, to which the deputies of the separate tribes repaired, and where they decided all matters quite independently. Josh. xxiii. 24 gives an example of an assembly of this kind: comp. J. D. Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht*, i. § 46; Jahn, i. c. § 14. Besides these rulers belonging to the patriarchal constitution, we find among the Israelites of the Mosaic time; and even later, proper officials called Schoterim or scribes, an institution necessitated by advanced civilisation, and resting on an Egyptian basis. In Egypt the scribes played a very important part: comp. *The Books of Moses and Egypt*, p. 86 ff. We find similar institutions in all cases where the rulers of the people are called to their position by birth. In such a constitution scribes, jurists, are indispensable so soon as the relations become at all involved.

This was the ordinary magistracy; and just as it was independent of the influence of the priesthood so also were those whom God promised to raise up at intervals under the name of judges, Deut. xvii. 12. In a certain sense they were civil dictators, but only in a certain sense, in everything pertaining to peace and war; for in other respects the princes, and elders, and scribes retained their authority, under the influence of the לְשֹׁטְרִים, it is true; but though great, this was generally free: comp. J. D. Michaelis, i. c. § 53. Nor was royalty subject to the priests in later times. The law respecting the king, Deut. xvii. 14–20, shows that Moses foresaw the establishment of kingship, and regarded it as compatible with the theocracy, which the evil-intentioned alone can confound with hierarchy. All determinations respecting it are directed solely to prevent kingship encroaching upon the theocracy, and are not designed to

exalt the hierarchy. How completely different the whole thing would have been if the latter had been intended, is clearly shown by the forced treatment which the older rationalism had to adopt to bring in this aim. It maintained that the words, "Thou shalt set him king over thee whom the Lord thy God shall choose," placed the choice of the king in the hands of the priests. But how strange that the entire history has no example of an elevation to the throne in which priests were active! In 2 Chron. xxiii. the question is only of a preservation of royalty for him to whom it belonged by divine right, and from whom it had been wrested by unrighteous usurpation. Samuel was not a priest, yet he was the instrument of the Lord in the choice of Saul and David, in whose family the supremacy of the kingdom of Judah was always to remain, and did so. In the kingdom of Israel the tribe of Levi did not exist. Elevations to the throne, in which divine co-operation is present, originate only with the prophets. Among the remaining ordinances there is not even an appearance of subservience to the interests of the priesthood. The king is to have a copy of the law beside him, in which he is to read daily, making it the rule of his conduct. On the assumption of a hierarchical tendency, the book of the law would rather have been given into the hands of the priests, to whom the king would have been directed. But in fact he was formally emancipated. He had as much right as they to draw independently from the source of all divine and human justice. The king is not to keep many horses, nor to amass large treasures. The possession of great earthly power, and the restless seeking for it, to which the law has especial reference, easily alienates from God. And in this case it was the less necessary, because God wished to manifest Himself as the helper of His people in their time of need, and to prove Himself mighty in their weakness. Finally, the king is forbidden to have many wives. The reason of this prohibition is best ascertained from the consequences of its violation in history. No trace of hierarchical interest is therefore to be found.

In order rightly to apprehend the distinction between the theocracy and the hierarchy, compare the position of the Egyptian kings with that of the Israelitish. All the counsellors of the Egyptian king, the judges, and the first officers, were

from the priesthood; comp. *Wilk.* part i. p. 257. Their whole conduct, even to the smallest details, was regulated by priestly prescriptions, and stood under priestly supervision. For instance, they were not at liberty to drink a glass of wine above the measure allotted by the priests, by whom the whole disposition of their day was regulated; comp. *Wilk.* p. 249 ff.

(2.) But it might appear that the Levites would gain the influence outwardly denied to them the more certainly and powerfully by their spiritual ascendancy. Here again history gives a negative answer; and it may easily be proved that even in this respect nothing happened which had not been designed by the lawgiver. The priests had certainly the best opportunity of getting education, but this education was by no means their monopoly. Every one who wished had equal facilities. The decree in Deut. xxxi. 11, 12, according to which the book of the law was to be read to the people every seven years, shows how little this, the main source of Israelitish education, was designed for them alone. Apart from this book of the law there was no religious mystery, least of all a scientific one. All those means which the priesthood in other countries of antiquity employed with such effect to promote superstition, and at the same time to increase their own importance—viz. witchcraft, necromancy, astrology, soothsaying, etc.—were strictly forbidden to the priests, no less than to all other Israelites, and mostly under pain of death: comp. Deut. xviii. 9–14. Just as distinctly as the law insists upon faith is it opposed to superstition, to further which is at all times the principal artifice of a supremacy-seeking priesthood. Here the Old Testament is distinctly on the side of the Evangelical Church against the Catholic, which has always spared superstition at least in practice, even fostering it, and using it as a means for its own purposes. The divine law shows relentless severity towards it. But the law concerning the prophets shows most plainly how little Moses intended this indirect influence, which certainly might and must have become important if the Levites had remained faithful to God, to be made subservient to self-interest. We cannot imagine a more powerful opponent against hierarchical interest. How could one and the same man have wished to raise the tribe of Levi to absolute supremacy, and yet have placed another class in opposition to it,

whose members were to stand in a far more immediate relation to God? And how great a contrast in this respect was presented by Egypt, where the prophets were only one class of priests! comp. Clem. Al. *Stromat.* i. p. 758; Wilk. i. p. 264. We have only to glance at the history to see how far the spiritual influence of the prophets outweighs that of the priests. After the establishment of royalty scarcely an important event happened in which the prophets had not the greatest share; and no important event took place in which traces of predominant priestly influence can be proved. The activity of the priesthood was at all times calm and noiseless. Instead of entering into the history in a grand way, like the prophets, they contented themselves with caring for the worship and instructing the people in the fear of God, to which last office they had been appointed by the lawgiver, Lev. x. 10, 11, and Deut. xxxiii. 10. For the fact that, on the whole, they fulfilled their insignificant but important calling satisfactorily, we have the unsuspected testimony of Malachi the prophet, in chap. ii. 5 ff., where, among other things, he says: "He feared me, and was afraid before my name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his life: he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity." Again, we see how little intention there was to raise the priests to spiritual rulers from the high dignity which Moses bestows upon all members of the community, filling their hearts with a consciousness of it, and pointing to the danger of abuse and misinterpretation, which was soon exemplified in the company of Korah. In Ex. xix. 6 he characterizes the whole community as a kingdom of priests, an holy nation, and therefore attributes the sacerdotal dignity to all their members; by his appointment the whole nation exercised priestly functions at the passover. The same thing appears from the wish which he expresses in Num. xi. 29, that "all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them."

The establishment of the priesthood is followed in the Pentateuch by the regulations treating of the distinction between clean and unclean, evidently because it was neglected at that time. Sin was not limited in its consequences merely to the province of the spirit. It also entered deeply into the corporeal region.

The consequence is, first of all, death; then the whole army of diseases; its dominion extending even to the brute creation, in which there is much that cannot belong to the original creation, and which plainly reflects the image of sin,—much that is distasteful, foul, impure, loathsome, which is shown to have arisen after the fall and in consequence of it, by the example of the serpent in Genesis, and again by the statement that all animals fed on grass: comp. Is. xi. These effects of sin in the region of visible things are designed to bring it to our consciousness. We ought not to shut our eyes to them, but should take to heart their complaining and accusing voices. Not to do this is a sign of a rude, irreligious mind; for example, to be indifferent to the sight of a corpse, instead of striking the breast and crying out, “God be gracious to me a sinner.” The Mosaic law, which is in all respects adapted to awaken remembrance of sin, partly gave expression to these natural feelings, partly tended to educate the *rudes* to them, and partly, by the prescribed purifications and atonements, led those whose consciousness of sin was in this way strongly aroused to the knowledge of forgiveness, which, together with the conviction of sin and by means of it, is the privilege of the people of God. The peculiar and transitory element is only this, that the feelings, in accordance with the symbolic spirit of antiquity, embody themselves in external acts and states: thus, whoever had touched a corpse, became outwardly impure and must purify himself; and none might eat of an animal bearing the image of sin.

But the Mosaic law did not include in the circle of these outward representations everything corporeal that stands in relation to sin. Otherwise it must have comprehended the whole circle of diseases. It limited itself to those points which were most prominent. The various kinds of legal uncleanness are the following:—

1. The uncleanness of death. Death is the wages of sin, Rom. vi. 23; those who are carnally dead are the terrible image of the νεκροὶ τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις, Eph. ii. 1; Col. ii. 13. No mirror reflects our image so plainly as this. Hence in the law no uncleanness is equal to that of death. Whoever has touched anything affected by death must purify himself by water and other symbols of purification.

The greatest uncleanness is that of the human corpse, for there death is the immediate wages of sin; to the rest of creation it has penetrated only in consequence of human sin. In the uncleanness of death it is clearly shown that external contamination has only a symbolic meaning: that it is not sin in itself, but only represents sin, and is designed to call forth the consciousness of it. It was a duty to contaminate one's self with the dead. Whoever from fear of uncleanness shrank from his duties towards those belonging to him, incurred grievous sin.

2. The uncleanness of leprosy. Leprosy made man in his living body a foul and loathsome abomination. That man can fall into such a state, shows clearly how low he has sunk. According to Schilling, *de lepra Commentationes*, rec. J. D. Haln, Lugd. Bat. 1778, the head of a leper bears the inscription, Horridior Morte. Hence in the Old Testament leprosy was frequently sent as a punishment for sin, as in the case of Miriam, Joab's descendants, 2 Sam. iii. 29, Uzziah, Gehazi, comp. Deut. xxiv. 8; and in the law it was made a leading symbol of sin. Whoever was afflicted with leprosy must withdraw from all intercourse with those who were pure, and must go about in torn garments, with uncovered head and covered chin, as a personified sin and wandering exhortation to repentance, crying out, Unclean! unclean! Lev. xiii. 45, 46. And it is noticeable that such a melancholy fate did not befall one who was pure and holy, but a sinner, representing not the sin of another, but one's own sin. Leprosy was not limited to men alone. Certain appearances in houses and clothes were also regarded as a leprosy, and were the object of purification and atonement, comp. Lev. xiv. 29. And since the lifeless cannot properly be an object of expiation, this shows that the expiation has here not a real but a symbolic meaning; that, from the nature of the thing, it does not concern outward uncleanness, but the human consciousness affected by it.

3. The uncleanness of bodily issues, as, for example, of issue of blood, of gonorrhea (also of cohabitation, which Sommer, in his treatise "Rein und Unrein," according to the Mosaic law, in the first volume of his biblical treatises, Bonn 1846, seeks in vain to set aside, because it does not accord with his system). Those passages—viz. Ezek. xxxvi. 17, Isa. lxiv.

6, Lam. i. 17—where sins are represented under the image of these impurities, show that it is only and solely on account of their loathsomeness and uncleanness that these are chosen as the image of sin, whose consequences they are; for even now no one can fall into them or come into contact with them without a feeling of the degradation of the human race.

4. Uncleanness of animals. For the point of view here, refer to Prov. xi. 22; Matt. vii. 6, "Neither cast ye your pearls before swine;" 2 Pet. ii. 22, "The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." Every human vice has its counterpart in the animal world, and, seeing this, man ought to repent. The law lays down certain marks for all four classes of the animal kingdom. In the first class, the larger land animals, the law is this: "Whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is cloven-footed, and cheweth the cud, among the beasts, that shall ye eat," Lev. xi. 3. It seems as if this determination were drawn from those animals which in no way raised a suspicion, bulls, sheep, and goats; these are regarded as normally pure. Therefore we are not to look for one particular kind of uncleanness in all animals. The hare, for example, was only reckoned among unclean animals because otherwise the principle would have been broken, and its extreme simplicity made its maintenance desirable, since the mark really occurred in by far the greater number of cases. Among birds no universal mark could be given, therefore the different kinds to be avoided are specified by name. These are mostly birds of prey, carnivorous birds, and those which are notorious for their uncleanness, such as the lapwing. Among water animals, again, a universal mark is laid down: "Whatsoever hath fins and scales in the waters, in the seas, and in the rivers, them shall ye eat." This excluded all of a repulsive form, water animals of the serpent and lizard kind, slimy shell-fish, and muscles. The eel also was forbidden as a consequence of the principle. The fourth class—small animals, mice, weasels, serpents, insects, etc.—are characterized as utterly unclean. Only locusts, a common article of food in the East, are excepted, and this is a concession to poverty. In the rank of unclean animals there is one class to which still greater uncleanness is attributed. It consists of eight animals, among which are the mouse, an

object of aversion to all nations, with its disagreeable ways, and six kinds of lizards.

We only remark further, that the Mosaic laws which relate to purity have been most thoroughly treated by Bähr in his *Symbolik des Mos. Cultus*, and by Sommer in the treatise already referred to. But both have in the main missed the goal. Bähr makes the corporeal conditions and relations with which the Levitical regulations respecting purification have to do, refer to generation and birth on one side, and on the other side to death, corruption, and putrefaction. But we have already shown, on the contrary, that in bodily issues the prevailing reference is not to their connection with generation and birth, but rather to the uncleanness, the loathsomeness, and the degradation of such things; nor can we accept such a reference without some nearer indication, for it lies pretty remote from the most of these conditions. But there is no trace of any such indication. In every case it is the flowing from the flesh itself, the unclean issue, which is said to be the cause of the uncleanness: comp. Lev. xv. 30. Sommer has erred still further in making all kinds of uncleanness have reference to death. It is evident that this can only be done by the greatest compulsion. Leprosy, for example, is looked upon as a kind of death, because, just as death is first proved by the appearance of coloured spots on the skin of the corpse, so leprosy begins with spots on the skin. Issues bear the properties of corruption and putrefaction, and therefore also the character of death. Just as forcibly is the uncleanness of animals put into conjunction with death; and there is the less occasion for such far-fetched deductions, since the corporeal consequences of sin, according to another biblical view, go beyond the region of death. Comp. what has already been quoted.

We now return to the historical representation. After another series of laws had been given, the second passover celebrated, the disposition of the camp determined, and the people numbered, the sign for breaking up was given. The sojourn on Sinai had lasted eleven months and twenty days. The Israelites had come there on the first day of the third month in the first year. They departed on the twentieth day of the second month in the second year of the deliverance. Among all the regions of the Arabic peninsula there was none

so well adapted for a long residence as this very spot, "where the air is pure and cool, and there is no vicious samoon, where springs flow abundantly, vegetation is luxuriant, apricots and oranges abound" (Raumer, p. 6).

§ 7.

FROM THE BREAKING UP ON SINAI TO THE DEATH OF MOSES.

NUM. X. TO THE END OF THE PENTATEUCH.

First, a general survey. About the beginning of May the children of Israel left the neighbourhood of Mount Sinai, and went to Kadesh under the guidance of Hobab the Midianite, who was acquainted with the region. Kadesh lay on the southern border of Canaan, at the foot of the high southern mountain chain of Palestine, and on the west border of Edom, at the north end of the valley already described, extending down from the Dead Sea to the Aelanitic Gulf, in the wilderness of Sin, the most northern part of the desert of Paran, whose limits, according to the researches of Tuch, correspond nearly with those of the present wilderness et-Tih. Rowlands thinks that he discovers Kadesh in the year 1842: comp. Ritter, p. 1088. The name, he maintains, still continues. "I was amazed," says Rowlands, "at the stream from the rock which Moses struck, and at the lovely little water-falls with which it plunges down into the lower bed of the brook." But the correctness of this discovery is still open to great doubt, which Fries, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, i., has by no means completely invalidated. Rowlands' Kadesh seems to lie too far west. Not long after the arrival of the Israelites, at the time of the first ripe grapes, or perhaps in the beginning of August, spies were sent into every part of the cultivated land; and after their return, the people sinned so grievously that they were condemned to a long wandering through the wilderness, though already so near to the promised land. Of this wandering our source gives no complete account, but contents itself with recording the names of a few stations where the Israelites sojourned for a time; a

circumstance which has been very superficially made use of as an argument by those who deny the forty years' duration of the march through the wilderness, although it has been attested not only by Moses, but also by Amos, chap. ii. 10, v. 25. During this whole period the Israelites had their principal camp constantly in the neighbourhood of Mount Seir, in the Arabah, and never returned to the district of Sinai: comp. *Balaam*, p. 287 ff. Yet they probably made use of all the resources of the country by their straggling parties; and not only of that, but also of the surrounding countries far and wide. In the Arabah, in the neighbourhood of Edom, it was easier for them to provide for many of their wants by trade than in any other part of the wilderness. In the first month of the fortieth year they returned to Kadesh. Their plan was to penetrate into Canaan through the country of the Edomites. Mount Seir in Edom, which, under the later names Djebal, Sherah, and Hiomeh, forms a ridge of mountains extending from the southern side of the Dead Sea to the ridge of Akabah, rises precipitately from the vallies el-Ghor and el-Arabah, and is only intersected by a pair of narrow wadis from west to east, of which the Wadi Ghuweir alone presents an entrance not quite inaccessible to a hostile power: comp. the preface of the English editor of Burckhardt's *Travels*, part i. p. 22 of the German translation. Probably Moses asked the Edomites for a passage through this valley on condition of leaving the fields and vineyards untouched, and of buying the necessaries of life. But the Edomites refused to allow Israel to pass through their territories, and Israel was forbidden to use power against them, because they were connected by race: comp. Deut. ii. Again deceived in their hopes, nothing remained for the Israelites but to follow the vale of the Arabah in a southerly direction towards the point of the Red Sea. On Mount Hor, which rises precipitately from the valley, "by the coast of the land of Edom," as we read in Num. xx., Aaron died, and was buried in a place visible far and wide, which even now passes in tradition for the place of his burial, and is unanimously regarded as such by Josephus, Eusebius, and Jerome. Israel then withdrew from Mount Hor to the Red Sea by the way of the fields from Elath and Eziongeber, Num. xxi. 4, till they turned and came to the wilderness of Moab and to the brook Zered, Deut.

ii. 9, 13. The Israelites did not go quite so far as Elath and Eziongeber on the Aelanitic Gulf, but followed the route which is still taken by the caravans. "These pass to the south of Mount Hor in the Wadi Arabah. A few hours northwards from Akabah and from ancient Eziongeber a valley, Getum, opens out from the east to the Wadi Arabah; first accurately described by Laborde. Through this valley the caravans proceed upwards to Ameima, and on to Maan, and so come to the high desert of Arabia Deserta, which lies 1000 feet higher than the wilderness et-Tih."—Raumer. When the Israelites had passed through the valley Getum, Moses received the command: "Ye have compassed this mountain long enough; turn you northward. Ye are to pass through this coast of your brethren the children of Esau, which dwell in Seir; and they shall be afraid of you." Deut. ii. 3 ff. At first it seems incomprehensible how the same Edomites, formerly so insolent, should now be afraid; it is hard to understand why Israel took such a circuit, instead of entering the country of the Edomites at once, if they wished to spoil their territory. But the geography explains all this. On the strongly-fortified western boundary the Israelites were dependent on the favours of Edom. But now, when they had gone round, they had come to the weak side of the country. Here they had no opposition to expect on the part of the Edomites; the less so, since the way did not lead through the middle of the cultivated land, but only through the wilderness, which formed the boundary. Passing over the brook Zered, Israel then came to the land of the Moabites. Like the present caravans they journeyed to a place called Rain, which formed the eastern boundary of the land, not touching the land of the Moabites itself. Then they crossed the brook Arnon, which separated the territory of the Amorites from that of the Moabites, close to its source in the wilderness, and came finally into the country belonging to that people whose territory was allotted to them. They began their work with the victory over Sihon of the Amorites, who dwelt in Heshbon.

So much for the geographical survey. We now pass to a nearer consideration of the separate events of this period. It falls naturally into two halves. One great section is formed by the determination to reject the generation then alive—all those

who had been more than twenty years old on the exodus from Egypt, with the exception of Joshua and Caleb; and the carrying out of this determination, which lasted for thirty-eight years, must be regarded as supplementary. The second half begins with the forty years of the march through the wilderness, when, after the time of punishment had expired, the theocracy, which had remained partially inactive during a whole series of years, again came into full vigour. In the former half the following events are to be noted.

1. The revolt of Israel at the first station, Taberah—*i.e.* the first station where anything remarkable occurred after the breaking up from Sinai. According to Num. x. 33, xi. 1 ff., Taberah was three days' journey from Sinai. The revolt was occasioned by the hardships of the journey; and in the judgment it called forth, with its speedy accomplishment, we see already a beginning of that severity which gradually increased from this time.

2. The revolt of the Israelites at the second important station, called "the graves of lust," on account of the divine judgment which befell them. The revolt was stirred up by the number of strange people who had joined themselves to Israel on the exodus, doubtless in the hope of escaping from their oppressed condition in Egypt, and of accompanying them without trouble into the possession of a land flowing with milk and honey. We first read of them in Ex. xii. 38: "And a mixed multitude went up also with them." Then they meet us again in Deut. xxix. 11, where these Egyptian strangers are represented as being very poor, and performing the most menial services. From the Egyptian system of caste we must expect to find such people already in Egypt. We certainly find them on the monuments, especially in that picture, already mentioned, which represents the Israelites making bricks. There we find Egyptians who exactly correspond with the hated and despised foreigners: comp. *The Books of Moses and Egypt*. These men have a typical meaning: they are the representatives of those who separate themselves from the world without internal grounds—of those who run along with others in the kingdom of God, and see themselves deceived in their hope. The manna seemed too uniform a food for them. They hankered after Egypt, and soon infected Israel also with their discontent.

Doubt, first of Moses' divine mission, then of God's omnipotence, who, they thought, was unable to make a better provision for His people, formed the kernel of the revolt. The twofold doubt is first virtually refuted, then punished. The first doubt was removed in the following manner: Moses was to choose from the elders of the people seventy men, and to bring them to the tabernacle of the covenant. To these the Lord imparted the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, which had before been possessed only by Moses in great measure; "and it came to pass, that, when the Spirit rested upon them, they prophesied, and did not cease." Num. xi. 25. There is no reason for supposing that these people predicted future things. This did not at all belong to the nature of the thing. The idea of prophecy is a wide one. It denotes a raising above the standpoint of the lower consciousness, effected by the immediate influence of divine power. The men made known to the nation in prophetic language that it was Moses whom the Lord had destined to be His servant and mediator, and reproached them in an impressive manner for their sin. The divine Spirit which impelled them, manifested itself in all their words and actions; and the phenomenon must have made the greater impression, since in all probability the majority of them had formerly themselves taken part in the insurrection. This idea finds special confirmation in a circumstance mentioned in Num. xi. 26, according to which two of those who were called had refused to appear, but were obliged to serve as witnesses to the truth, even against their will. For the rest, it is easy to refute such as maintain that these seventy elders formed a college which continued till the death of Moses, as J. D. Michaelis does in his *Mos. Recht*, and Bertheau (p. 253), who confounds them with the judges established by Moses, Ex. xviii. and Deut. i.; or, again, those who see here the origin of the post-exile council of seventy elders or the Sanhedrim. For, apart from the fact that in all subsequent history until the time of the Babylonish captivity there is no trace of such a council, it is expressly stated in the narrative, Num. xi. 25, that the elders no longer possessed the gift of prophecy, imparted to them for a momentary object: "And it came to pass that when the Spirit rested upon them, they prophesied," but did not continue: נִבְּאוּ, —correctly rendered καὶ οὐκ ἔτι προσέθεντο by the LXX.;

falsely by the Vulgate and Luther: "they ceased not." This also we must expect beforehand. Permanent possession of the extraordinary divine gifts of grace presupposes full possession of the ordinary; and we have already seen that the majority of the seventy elders possessed these in an inferior degree. Even a Balaam may serve as God's instrument in isolated cases; but a Balaam can never be a prophet by office.

The second doubt was refuted by the sending of quails—not to be confounded with those mentioned in Ex. xvi. (which were sent only for one day, not so much to satisfy the want of the Israelites as to show that God could satisfy it)—which continued for a month. The circumstance that Moses is at a loss to know where God will procure food for such a multitude of men, instead of remembering that earlier food, has its analogy in the conduct of the disciples, who, when the Lord wished to feed the multitude, answered, "Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness, as to fill so great a multitude?" Matt. xv. 33; forgetting the feeding of the 5000, which had already taken place. Comp. also Matt. xvi. 9, 10, where the Saviour reproaches His disciples because they had again forgotten both these miracles. But he who has attained to some knowledge of his own heart requires no such analogy. That which appears improbable on a superficial consideration, is quite natural to him. We have already pointed out that the sending of the quails, as well as the manna, had a natural basis. In their wanderings by the sea, towards Egypt and Arabia, they meet with incredibly large flocks. Josephus says that Arabia has a greater abundance of quails than of any other kind of bird (*Antt.* 3, chap. i.). Diod. Sic. i. 60 narrates that whole flocks of quails fly over the Red Sea, so that the people living there can get as many as they wish from the birds which have fallen down on the shore: comp. Oedmann's *Vermischte Sammlungen*, part iii. sec. 6. In the same district Schubert saw whole clouds of birds of passage pass over in the distance, of such extent and density as no traveller has seen elsewhere. They came from their southern winter abode, and hastened to their home on the sea-coast. Comp. Ritter, p. 268. Even now the Bedouins capture those quails which are weary with flight, not with nets, but with their hands. After the virtual refutation of the doubt, the punishment follows; and the fact that it

should have taken place just at this time, shows that mercy is associated with severity. For only now were the people in a position where punishment could exercise a salutary influence: their proud spirit was broken, they felt that they had sinned. The instrument of punishment was a ravaging disease, caused by satiety. In granting the wish, the punishment was prepared; comp. Num. xi. 20, 33 with Ps. lxxviii. 29-31.

3. The dispute between Moses and his relatives, Aaron and Miriam, besides being a symptom of the prevailing disposition, is important as a station on the way of trial in which Moses is led, as well as Israel; but still more important as the occasion of a divine declaration of the dignity of Moses, who, as founder of the Old Testament economy, stands in a closer and more intimate relation to God than any other servant under the Old Testament; to whom, therefore, every other must be subordinate. This declaration, Num. xii. 6-8, already determines the whole relation of the prophethood to Moses. No prophet dare place himself on a level with Moses. The whole subsequent prophethood must rest upon the Pentateuch. The divine illumination of ordinary prophets is partial, intermittent, and characterized by want of clearness; on the other hand, that of Moses is continuous, and associated with the most perfect clearness. His relation to the Lord is much more intimate. The dispute was occasioned by Moses' marriage with a foreigner, Zipporah. The pride of Miriam, who wished to place herself on a level with Moses, on account of the prophetic gift (already in Ex. xv. 20 ff. she is called נְבִיאָה, prophetess, by no means synonymous with poetess), which misled Aaron also, took this occasion to depreciate Moses. Hazeroth is said to be the place where the event occurred. It has been recently supposed to have been discovered in the fountain Hadhra, in whose neighbourhood are date trees and the remains of walls which enclosed former plantations—*Chazeroth loca septo circumdata*. In favour of this view we have not only the agreement of name, but also the suitableness of situation. Hadhra lies just in the direction taken by the Israelites; and by Robinson's account (i. p. 249), is about eighteen hours distant from Sinai. The spring is the only one in the district which gives good water through the whole year, and was therefore a very important locality for such a land.

4. Now follows the sending of the spies. This itself was due, if not to want of faith, yet to its weakness. What need had they for information concerning the fruitfulness of the land, if they would only trust in the Lord, who had pledged His word for it? The strength or weakness of the inhabitants might have been a matter of indifference to them. The Lord, who had conquered the Egyptians for them, had said that He would drive out the inhabitants. Yet even here the Lord had forbearance toward their weakness. He granted their desire, because the sending of the spies was calculated to strengthen the weak faith of the well-disposed. On the one hand, the word of God would receive visible confirmation—the spies must bear witness that the land is exactly as God described it—and it would thus be easier for them to trust the mere word with reference to the other great promise, the conquest of the enemy. The forbearance ceased when, after the return of the spies, unbelief broke out into open revolt with greater strength and universality than had ever before happened. By the divine decree the period of trial now ceased for all those who had been fully capable of forming an independent judgment at the time of the exodus from Egypt; although it still continued for the younger generation. Those who are irrevocably given over to judgment, who have fallen from grace, are no longer tried.

It is remarkable that the temptation which has rejection for its consequence is the tenth. The circumstance that the period of trial should have concluded with it, can scarcely be regarded as accidental, since it is expressly made prominent in the narrative itself, Num. xiv. 22. The ten temptations are the following: Ex. v. 20, 21; xiv. 11, 12; xv. 22–27; xvi. 2, 3; xvi. 20; xvii. 1–7; xxxii.; Num. xi. 1–4, 5–34; xiv. They stand in manifest relation to the ten plagues—ten great proofs of God's power and mercy, and ten great proofs of the nation's hard-heartedness and ingratitude: the end of the ten plagues, deliverance; the end of the temptations, rejection. With the last and greatest temptation, the nation return to that state from which God had delivered them by the last and greatest plague. The similarity of number here serves only to point to the internal relation, as is often the case in Scripture. The two fundamental ideas are these: God's requirements are always in proportion to the measure of His gifts; when He has given

He also proves how the gift has been employed. Every gift becomes injurious to him who is not led by it to the giver. This is the nucleus of the ten events considered as temptations. The second fundamental idea is this: Great as God's mercy is, so great is man's hard-heartedness. "Watch, therefore, and pray, lest ye enter into temptation." This is the essence of the ten events considered as temptations of God on the part of the Israelites. We have no information relative to the condition of the children of Israel during the years of their exile except what is contained in Amos v. 25, 26: "Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? But ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch and Chiun, your images, the star of your God, which ye made to yourselves." The forty years are a round number, instead of the more accurate thirty-eight; so also in Num. xiv. 33, 34, Josh. v. 6. Amos tells us that the great mass of the people neglected to honour the Lord by sacrifices during the larger part of the march through the wilderness; and in the place of Jehovah, the God of armies, substituted a borrowed god of heaven, whom they worshipped, together with the remaining host of heaven, with a borrowed worship. What the Lord had denied to His faithless people, they sought from their idols, without, however, being able to forsake the Lord entirely. In harmony with this is Ezek. xx. 25, 26, where, with reference to Israel in the wilderness, we read: "Wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live; and I polluted them in their own gifts." The fact that the melancholy errors of Israel are here traced back to God, and that He appears as the original cause of their blinded syncretism, is explained by Rom. i. 24, Acts vii. 42, 2 Thess. ii. 11.

5. It is certain that there were many other revolts during this long period, up to the fortieth year. But these have no more to do with the plan of the history, which occupied itself only with the people of God, than the iniquities of the Israelites and Jews who were led away in the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles, and which are not copiously narrated. That the shortness and meagreness in describing this period can be attributed only to design, appears from the great accuracy with which, before and afterwards, the year and month and day of the events are

given. A vague tradition would have wavered from this side to that, and have been indefinite: comp. Ex. xvi. 1, xix. 1, xl. 2, 17; Num. xx. 1, xxxiii. 8. We cannot maintain, with Kurtz, that the rejection had reference merely to exclusion from the land of Canaan, from the simple fact that the administration of the two sacraments of the Old Testament, of circumcision and the passover, was suspended. But, on the other hand, the rejection must not be regarded as absolute. There still remained many tokens of grace, notwithstanding the banishment, which was intended not only to terrify but also to allure. But, on the whole, there was a suspension of the relations of grace, which necessarily occasions an interruption of the historical narrative. We hear only of one revolt—the Korahitic, Num. xvi. 17—because the double divine confirmation of the priesthood to which it gave rise was of the greatest importance for subsequent time. From the special object of the revolt, it is apparent also that divine retribution once more appeared in a visible form. In other cases, retribution took place in an ordinary way, as a natural consequence of the rejection of the people, because Israel had now entered more into the relation of the heathen nations. Amid the difficulties of the march through the wilderness, where even now, Rüppell observes, there are few aged people, and amid the gnawing pangs of conscience, death slowly and imperceptibly snatched away all its victims. The pretended accusation which Korah and his company bring against Moses is noteworthy: “All the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them; wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?” It is a symptom of deep degradation when authorities are no longer recognised. The cry for equality is the harbinger of judgment. It is plain that there was a reference to the opening speech of the Sinaitic lawgiver: “Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation,” Ex. xix. 6. From the dignity conferred upon the whole nation, they think themselves at liberty to conclude that there can be no degrees of dignity, when the very contrary was the true inference; for, by the same free grace by which God raised up Israel out of the midst of the heathen, He could again raise up a single man, or a single class, from among the rest. They cannot apprehend the reasons for this proceeding, this

election among the elect, because they do not know themselves, nor the state of the people, and are therefore unable to estimate the significance of an institution which presupposes the weakness of the nation. They lay claim to the possession of the full rights prepared, as they imagine, for the people of God, without considering the great contrast between idea and reality in the fulfilment of their duties. Instead of making it their first business to fulfil these, they immediately stretch out their hand for the rights. The revolt consisted of a double element: first Korah and his Levitical company; then the Reubenites, Dathan and Abiram. The true originator was Korah. Hence the Reubenites are called the people of Korah, Num. xvi. 32. The punishment was twofold, appropriate to the two distinct elements. The Reubenites are swallowed up by the earth; while Korah and his Levites are punished by fire, because they had sinned by fire. They stood with their vessels of incense before the tent of assembly, in the performance of the priestly dignity which they had claimed. Then went out fire from the Lord, and consumed them—an awful example for all those who would use the exalted privileges of the people of God in the interest of their own selfishness and darkness! The miracle of the green, budding rod had a symbolical meaning. It pointed to the fact, that the priesthood among Israel would flourish and bud; a promise which, according to Zechariah, received its final fulfilment in Christ.

So much for the first half of our period. In the second, which begins with the fortieth year of the march, the following events are to be noticed:—

1. The water from the rock.—The older generation had almost died out. Now begin the temptations of the new generation; and what is remarkable, their beginning is exactly similar to that of the former. The people murmured when they wanted water, and longed for Egypt again. The Lord now shows them that He is again in their midst. But Moses and Aaron are excluded from the land of Canaan by reason of the weakness of their faith, which finds expression in the circumstance, that Moses, who had never till then forgotten himself before the people, now addresses them in irritable despondency: “Hear now, ye rebels; must we fetch you water out of this rock?” and then strikes twice in haste and disquietude, not sure of his

cause. This weakness of faith, which shows plainly that the covenant of which Moses was the mediator was only preliminary, and virtually points to a perfect, sinless Mediator, who could not come forth from among men conceived and born in sin, is much more intelligible, if we regard the temptation as a new beginning. Moses and Aaron had already suffered so much from the earlier generation, in the hope that the new generation would prove itself better; and now, all at once, they saw that the beginning was like the end. Their faith wavered. Pain and sorrow kept them from rising to joyful trust. It was not God's power, but His mercy, that they doubted, for they regarded the sinfulness of the nation as too great to allow any expression of mercy. This tendency to despond is a temptation which we find in the life of all true servants of God. Luther had to contend very strongly against it, especially in the later years of his life, when he was so often surrounded by all that was dreary. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the punishment of Moses and Aaron was really aimed at the people through them. Apart from this design, God would certainly have pardoned the leaders their transgression, which was comparatively small. This appears from the simple reason, that the relations of grace were continued to Moses and Aaron. Their punishment was designed to call the nation to repentance. The weak faith of their leader was only an echo of their unbelief. They were to hate the sin which had shut out their leaders from the land of promise. We only remark further, that the place, which had till then been called Barnea, first received the name of Kadesh from this event; as is shown in the third volume of the *Beiträge*. Ewald's opinion, that the place had been a sanctuary and an oracle in an oasis in the desert long before Moses, is erroneous, as the name Kadesh already shows. It was called Kadesh, because Jehovah had sanctified and glorified Himself there.

2. The plague of serpents.—This was occasioned by the renewed murmuring of the people, called forth by a new temptation from the Lord, who disposed the hearts of the Idumaeans to refuse them a passage when they were again on the borders of the promised land, at Kadesh, so that they were once more obliged to undertake a difficult march. According to Num. xxi. 4 this incident occurred on the western side of

the Edomite mountains, probably not far from the northern point of the Aelanitic Gulf. From Burckhardt's *Sketches*, part ii. p. 814, we learn that the plague had a natural substratum in the district through which they then journeyed. In the region about the Aelanitic Gulf he saw many traces of serpents in the sand, and was told by the Arabs that serpents were very common in that district, and that the fishermen were very much afraid of them, and in the evening, before going to sleep, extinguished their fire, because it was known that fire attracted them. Herodotus, ii. 75, already mentions that winged serpents come to Egypt from the Arabian desert in great numbers, and are there destroyed by the ibis: comp. Bähr, p. 652. In Schubert's *Account of the Journey in the Arabah to Hor*, part ii. p. 406, he says: "At noon a large serpent was brought to us, very variegated, marked with fiery red spots and spiral stripes; and from the structure of its teeth, we saw that it was of a poisonous kind." According to the Bedouins, who are very much afraid of this serpent, it is very common in the district; comp. Ritter, p. 330, who mentions it as a remarkable thing, that serpents are still common in the very place where the Israelites were visited by the plague of serpents, while in other parts of the peninsula they are but rarely met with. The subsequent healing shows, however, that the plague was nevertheless to be regarded as a punishment. It would have been just as easy for God to have kept the Israelites free from sin as to have healed them after they had repented. The genuine repentance which followed the infliction of the punishment showed that there was a better basis in the new generation than in the old. The healing was attached to an outward sign—the looking at the brazen serpent—in order to bring its divine origin more vividly to the consciousness. According to the usual acceptation, the serpent is to be regarded as a symbol of the healing power of God. Under the image of a serpent, it is said, the Egyptians honoured the Divine Being, whom they called Ich-nuphi, the good Spirit, and whom they regarded as the originator of all good and happy events; comp. Jablonsky, panth. i. chap. 4. Among the Greeks the serpent was an attribute of Esculapius. But this hypothesis is overthrown by the one circumstance that in Num. xxi. 8 it is said: "Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole." The meaning of

שרף cannot be misunderstood. The serpent means burning, because its poison resembles consuming fire. For similar reasons, certain serpents were called *πρηστίηρες* and *καύσωνες* in Greek. The Vulgate renders שרף by *serpens flatu adurens*. According to this, the poison in the serpent must be the special point under consideration; a property which must be excluded, if it be regarded as a symbol of the healing power of God. There is only one way in which we can do justice to the fiery serpent here, in its connection with ver. 6—"And the Lord sent fiery serpents among the people"—viz., by assuming that the brazen serpent, no less than the living one, denotes the power of evil: the distinction consisting only in this, that the brazen serpent is the evil power overcome by God's power. It is noteworthy that Moses does not take a living serpent, but a dead image of it, as a sign of its subjugation by the healing power of the law. If the meaning of the serpent be here rightly determined, then its typical character, which our Lord teaches in John iii. 14, 15, also appears in its true light. Christ is the antitype of the serpent, in so far as He took upon Himself the most injurious of all injurious powers, sin, and atoned for it by substitution. What here happened with regard to the lower hostile power, was a guarantee that similar effectual assistance would be granted in the future against this worst enemy; what here happened for the preservation of corporeal life, was an actual prophecy of that future event which was to effect the preservation of eternal life. And those who are inclined summarily to reject the healing of the Israelites, by looking at the brazen serpent as mythical, may learn modesty from the fact, that the Egyptian serpent-charmers are able to protect themselves and others from the bite even of the most poisonous serpents in a way that has never yet been satisfactorily explained. The scholars of the French expedition, notwithstanding their tendency to deride everything as superstition and charlatanry, are yet obliged to concede this. Jollois in the *Descript.*, t. 18, p. 333 ff., says: "We confess that, though far removed from all credulity, we have ourselves been witnesses of an event so remarkable, that we are not able to regard the art of the serpent-tamers as altogether chimerical." If we are here obliged to acknowledge a mystery even

in the province of nature, how much less can we make the intelligible a criterion of the true!

3. The victory over the kings Sihon and Og.—The English edition of Burckhardt still maintains that the Israelites passed through the middle of the land of Moab, after the Edomites had allowed them a free passage. But this is manifestly at variance with the narrative, comp. Num. xxi. 11 ff. The Israelites first journeyed eastwards through the wilderness, round the southern part of the land of Moab, with whose inhabitants they were forbidden to commence warfare. Then they crossed over the Upper Sared, which is probably the Wadi Kerek. And here the punishment came to an end, comp. Deut. ii. 14–16. Without touching the inhabited land of the Moabites, they now kept closer to the eastern boundary, crossed the Arnon near its sources in the wilderness; so that after the passage they were not yet in the territory of the Amorites, but to the east of it. This is in harmony with Deuteronomy, which does not refer to a passing through the actual territory of the Moabites, and according to which the Israelites, after having passed over the Arnon, sent ambassadors from the wilderness of Kedemoth to Sihon, chap. ii. 24 ff. If they had gone through the middle of the Moabite country, they would have crossed the Arnon at the place where they entered the land of the Amorites. Compare also the explicit statement in Judg. xi. 18: "Then they went along through the wilderness, and compassed the land of Edom and the land of Moab, and came by the east side of the land of Moab, and pitched on the other side of Arnon, but came not within the border of Moab." The Canaanitish population of the Amorites had their proper seat in the cis-Jordanic country, in what was afterwards the mountainous district of Judah, comp. Num. xiii. 30. But not long before the occupation of Canaan by the Israelites, the Amorites had undertaken a war against the Moabites, and had taken the greater part of their territory from them, so that they retained only the land from the Arnon to the southern portion of the Dead Sea, or the border of the Idumaeans. The Amorites had made Heshbon their capital. We learn from Num. xxi. 29 that the Sihon conquered by the Israelites had previously taken this town from the Moabites. The land then in possession of the Amorites was promised to the Israelites; for, according to the

promise, all that country belonged to them which was in the possession of Canaanitish nationalities. But we have already proved that these districts were not only a temporary, but also an original, possession of Canaan. We have shown that the Amorites only reconquered under the visible guidance of divine providence what had formerly belonged to them. Only in this way could the land come into the possession of the Israelites, for they were not allowed to take away anything from the Moabites. At first, however, they only asked a free passage from Sihon; and it was not until this had been refused, and an attack had been made upon them by Sihon himself, who marched against them in the wilderness, that they conquered him and took possession of his territory. It has been a frequent matter of perplexity that the Israelites at the divine command should have sent an embassy to Sihon while his territory belonged to them irrevocably. But contradiction falls away if we only consider that Sihon's rejection of the proposal was foreseen by God. The object of the embassy was not to move him to grant that which was requested, but only to show him how those whom God intends to punish must run blindly to their own destruction. The deliverance is put into his own hand, but he must cast it away from him, comp. Deut. ii. 30. The customary opinion is, that the Israelites journeyed northwards into the country of the king of Bashan, who was also a Canaanite, and in whose territory the Canaanitish supremacy had continued without interruption. After he also had been conquered, they returned to that district which was best calculated to afford them an entrance into the cis-Jordanic country, viz. the west, that part of the land of the Amorites which lay along the river Jordan, opposite Jericho, still called ערבות מואב from its earlier inhabitants, *i.e.* the Moabitic part of the Arabah, or the valley which extends from the sea of Gennesareth to the Aelanitic Gulf: comp. *Balaam*, p. 227. But the correct view is this: After the power of Sihon had been broken in battle, the main camp of the Israelites, leaving the wilderness, moved towards the west, across Mattana, Nahaliel, and Bamoth, to the valley before the Nebo, which, according to the argument in the work on *Balaam*, lies about an hour west of Heshbon; a view which has also been recognised as the correct one by Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 15 (1851), p. 1177. By separate detach-

ments sent out from these stations the whole land of Sihon was conquered. Then, making this place their headquarters, the Israelites undertook a march against Og: comp. *Balaam*, p. 25 ff., for proof that all Israel did not take part in the march against upper Gilead and Bashan. After the return of the expedition, the Israelites left their headquarters and encamped in the plains of Moab, immediately facing the land of promise, and only separated from it by the Jordan. Here a series of remarkable events took place: Balaam's blessing, Israel's sin by participation in the worship of Baal, the conquest of Midian, the conclusion of a new covenant, the death of Moses.

4. Balaam.—The centre of this whole narrative, Num. xxii.-xxiv., which Gesenius on Is., p. 504, called "a truly epic representation, worthy the greatest poet of all times," is the blessing which a strange prophet, summoned with hostile intent, with a disposition to curse, is constrained by Jehovah's power to pronounce upon His people. The object was, to show Israel for all times the height of their calling, and, in a living picture of God, to place them in a relation towards His church which should continue through all time. Balak, the king of the Moabites, had, it is true, nothing to fear from the Israelites. They had assured him that his people were safe from them. But he had no faith in the assurance. He believed that, when the Israelites had done with the other nations, his turn would come. He therefore allied himself on mutual terms with the neighbouring Midianites dwelling in that part of Arabia which lay nearest to Moab. The Israelites themselves ascribed their victory, not to their own power, but to the help of their God. He therefore thought that he could effect nothing against them until he had deprived them of the protection of this God. For this purpose he wished to make use of means which were held to be effectual among almost all heathen nations. They had a distortion of the true-religion doctrine of the power of intercession, in the opinion that men who stand in close relation to a deity exercise a sort of constraint upon him, and by uttered imprecations can plunge individual men and whole nations into inevitable misfortune. Plutarch, for example, in his *Life of Crassus*, relates how a tribune of the people who did not wish Crassus to conquer the Parthians ran to the gate, there set down a burning censer,

strewed incense upon it, and gave utterance to awful and terrible curses, calling upon fearful deities. Plutarch adds, that the Romans attribute such power to these mysterious and ancient formulas of cursing, that the person against whom they are directed is overtaken by inevitable misfortune. Macrobius, iii. 9, has preserved a formula of this kind for us. Balak believed that no one was better adapted for the carrying out of his wish than Balaam, a far-famed soothsayer, prophet, and sorcerer who dwelt at Pethor in Mesopotamia; particularly since he performed his acts in the name of the same God whose protection was to be withdrawn from Israel. The name is composed of בָּלַע, devouring, and עַם, people. Balaam bore it as a dreaded sorcerer and enchanter. John follows this interpretation in the Apocalypse, translating the name of Balaam by Νικόλαος. The judgments on Balaam's personality are directly at variance with one another. Many, after the example of Ambrose, Cyril, and Augustine, regard him as a hardened villain, an enchanter who, by the help of evil spirits, was able to prophesy and perform wonders. Others, following Tertullian and Jerome, maintain that he was a true prophet and a thoroughly upright man, who afterwards fell grievously. So, for example, Buddeus, who calls him *horrendum apostasias exemplum*. But, as is often the case, both views are incorrect, for both rest on the false presupposition of the *tertium non datur*, while this *tertium* is in reality much more frequent than the *primum* and *secundum*. Before setting forth the correct view we must answer the question, whence had Balaam that knowledge of Jehovah which he undeniably possessed, and without which Balak would not have sent for him? The general opinion is, that a certain knowledge of Jehovah had been retained in that region from primitive times. Buddeus remarks: "Vixerat in eo tractu Laban, Jacobus filios omnes excepto Beniamine ibi genuerat." But much cannot be accounted for in this way, and a single circumstance may suffice to demonstrate it. The allusions in Balaam's prophecies to earlier utterances of God, which had been given to Israel, are unmistakeable. Thus the form in which Israel's great increase is foretold in the first speech, points to the promises in Gen. xiii. 16, xxviii. 14. The picture of the reposing lion which none dare awaken, in the third speech, reminds us of Jacob's blessing

on Judah, Gen. xlix. 9; and the same speech concludes with the words, "Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee," Gen. xxvii. 29. Moreover, the knowledge displayed by Balaam of the nature and will of Jehovah the God of Israel, is too exact and definite to have been derived from isolated, faint tones which had reached him from that primitive revelation which itself knew little of the God of Israel. If we assume that Balaam drew only from it, we must maintain, what has no analogy in its favour, that in his prophecies he was a mere passive tool, that he gave utterance to conceptions for which there was no *rapport* in his nature. This is certainly the way in which the thing must be looked at. In the song, after the passage through the Red Sea, it is already stated that the fame of God's mighty deeds towards Israel would spread fear and wonder far and wide, Ex. xv. 14; comp. also Ex. ix. 16. That this was the case is shown by Josh. v. 1: "And it came to pass, when all the kings of the Amorites, which were on the side of Jordan westward, and all the kings of the Canaanites, which were by the sea, heard that the Lord had dried up the waters of Jordan from before the children of Israel, until we were passed over, that their heart melted, neither was there spirit in them any more, because of the children of Israel;" and other passages. The great multitude now remained in simple wonder and simple fear, without going any deeper into the matter; but a few—those who had previously possessed a lively, religious interest—sought to investigate the thing more closely. They made use of every opportunity to learn more of Jehovah, of His relation to Israel, of His promises and of His acts. We have an example of this in Jethro, of whom we read in Ex. xviii. 1 ff.: "Jethro, the priest of Midian, Moses' father-in-law, heard of all that God had done for Moses, and for Israel His people, that the Lord had brought Israel out of Egypt. And Jethro rejoiced for all the goodness which the Lord had done to Israel, whom He had delivered out of the hand of the Egyptians, and out of the hand of Pharaoh. Now I know that the Lord is greater than all gods." He had not yet attained to the knowledge that Jehovah was the only God; but he never questions His supremacy over all other gods. We have a second example in Rahab, who, in Josh. ii. 9 ff., herself relates how she had

come to the knowledge that the God of Israel was God in heaven above and in the earth beneath, by the noble acts of Jehovah, the passage through the Red Sea, etc. And this is the category in which we must place Balaam. Hitherto he had followed the trade of an astrologer and enchanter, in the interest of those passions by which he was swayed, viz. avarice and ambition. He now heard of the God of Israel, and by connection with so mighty a God he hoped to be able to do great deeds. He was thus His professed adherent. Just as many in the time of Christ cast out devils in His name, so Balaam now came forward in the name of Jehovah, calling Him his God: comp. Num. xxii. 8. But he did not therefore at once become a true prophet, any more than his New Testament antitype Simon Magus. The same divided purpose was common to both; and what Peter and John say to Simon is perfectly applicable to Balaam, Acts viii. 21: "οὐκ ἔστι σοι μερίς οὐδὲ κλῆρος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ. ἡ γὰρ καρδιά σου οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθεία ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ." He certainly was not a complete hypocrite. Nor was Simon. For if his heart had been wholly untouched, how could the apostle have baptized him? Without assuming a basis of true fear of God, it is impossible to explain Balaam's conduct on receiving the offer of the Moabites, his subsequent behaviour, and the fact that he afterwards blessed instead of cursing. But he had not turned to the truth with his whole heart, otherwise he would at once have rejected the proposal of the Moabites with horror; nor could he have hoped that God would alter His will after He had once revealed it to him. It is therefore not quite correct to characterize his subsequent conduct as *horrendum apostasias exemplum*. Apostasy presupposes perfect union before. But in his case this had not existed; the pure and the impure elements had been present in him in troubled confusion. After God, in fulfilment of His design, had entered into the former element without whose existence the whole appearance of the prophet is incomprehensible, he was swayed by the latter alone, and this by his own fault, because he loved the wages of unrighteousness, 2 Pet. ii. 15. The same confusion which prevailed in his heart is also apparent in his judgment. In spite of all his religious insight he follows auguries, chap. xxiii. 3 and xxix. 1; thus showing how faint and indistinct the voice of God was

within him. If his union with the Lord had been perfectly true and intimate, he would not have sought Him in nature, but only in the word. In Josh. xiii. 22 he is called קוסם, "the soothsayer." Only by virtue of preconceived theory has it been maintained that נחשים, which always means auguries, such as were strictly repudiated among Israel, and קוסם may also be used in a good sense.

We shall now occupy ourselves with the occurrence by the way. Balaam is so far led astray by covetousness and avarice that he does not at once reject the proposal of the king, as he ought to have done; but still retains so much fear of God that he does reject it after the Lord has expressly forbidden him to comply with it. He met a second embassy of the king with the distinct declaration that he would speak only what the Lord commanded him; yet his passion leads him to ask the Lord a second time whether he may not comply with the desire of the king. And this time he receives permission to undertake the journey, but under a condition which made it utterly aimless and impracticable, as any one not blinded by passion would at once have seen. But Balaam grasps the permission in both hands, without examination, and sets out with the princes of Moab. The nearer he came to the end of his journey, the more he was influenced by the possessions and honours which there awaited him, in event of his compliance with the desire of the king. If he were left to himself, it was to be expected that he would curse Israel. In itself this curse would have had no weight; for an unworthy servant can exercise no constraint upon the God of Israel. But for the consciousness of Israel and of their enemies it had great significance. If, on the other hand, he were to pronounce a blessing instead of the desired curse, the effect produced would be the more marked, since he would here be acting contrary to his own advantage. An influence of God interrupting the influence of nature was here sufficiently indicated. The way in which Balaam at first acted towards this divine manifestation shows how low he had fallen; and how necessary this influence was if the curse were to be hindered. The appearance of the Lord, which inspires even the ass with terror, is invisible to his sin-darkened eye. The resistance of the ass, caused by the threatening aspect of the Angel of the Lord, causes him to look inward; the power of sin is

broken, and, thus prepared, God is able to open his eyes to see the angel standing before him in the way with a drawn sword. The earnest warning and threat addressed to him by the angel finds access to his mind; he confesses that he has sinned, and offers to turn back. But since it was God's design not only that he should refrain from cursing, but also that he should bless, he is directed to continue his journey; but he is not to say anything except what God tells him. It is a question of very minor importance whether the speaking of the ass is to be regarded as an internal or an external event; whether God suffered the animal to speak to Balaam subjectively or objectively. The principal argument for the acceptance of an external occurrence, viz. that it is arbitrary to assume the interiority of an event when it is not expressly stated, has been set aside by what has already been said. When Kurtz, in his desire to maintain the externality of the occurrence, states that there is nothing in the vision of which this is not expressly predicated in the narrative, we have only to call to mind the Mosaic account of the burning bush, which, according to Acts, was a vision. The following are some of the arguments which speak for the subjective nature of the occurrence: 1. In Numbers xii. 6 visions and dreams are characterized as the ordinary methods of God's revelation to the prophets. 2. In the introduction to his third and fourth prophecies, Balaam calls himself a seer by profession; and in chap. xxii. 8 and 19 he invites the Moabitish ambassadors to remain with him over night, the time of prophetic visions, that he might receive divine revelations. The appearance of the angel, which preceded the speaking of the ass, had an internal character; but here we must strictly separate between interiority and identity with fancy, a confusion into which Kurtz has recently fallen. The objectivity of the appearance cannot be doubted. The only question is in what way that which was objectively present was apprehended and recognised. The interiority of the occurrence is proved by one argument alone, viz. that God is obliged to open Balaam's eyes before he can see the angel. Such an operation is unnecessary in that which falls within the sphere of the five senses. For these two reasons we gain a distinct advantage in favour of the interiority of the event. 3. Not only is there no mention of surprise on the part of Balaam, but

its existence is quite excluded by chap. xxii. 29. The speaking of the ass, in itself, makes no impression on him, but he is led to reflection by what it says. 4. In the company of Balaam were the two servants and the Moabitish ambassadors; but they guessed nothing whatever of all that passed. Jehovah opened the mouth of the ass; He caused the ass to speak to Balaam in the vision; He gave it words corresponding to its whole appearance and expression. He made the ass to speak for Balaam, while for all the rest of the world the beast of burden remained dumb.

There can be no doubt that the prophecies of Balaam must be attributed to divine revelation; and it is scarcely conceivable how Steudel can deny it, as he does in his treatise "*die Geschichte Bileam's und seine Weissagungen*," in the *Tübingen Periodical*, 1831. Only in this way can we explain the acceptance of the whole narrative by the author. It is not his object simply to give a short history. Moreover, the later prophets employed these utterances of God as such. Samuel brings the utterance in chap. xxiii. 19 to bear upon Saul, 1 Sam. xv. 29. David's last words in 2 Sam. xxiii. 1 rest upon Balaam's words. Habakkuk in chap. i. 3, 13 brings before God the words which He has spoken through Balaam. The prophecy of Jeremiah, chap. xlviii. 45, against Moab, is a repetition of that of Balaam, chap. xxiv. 17. The narrative itself expressly says, "The Spirit of God came upon Balaam," chap. xxiv. 2; "The Lord put a word in Balaam's mouth," chap. xxiii. 5; and one argument alone is sufficient to refute Steudel's strange view, that the narrative originated with Balaam himself, and was taken unaltered by Moses into the Pentateuch, viz. the use of the divine names. When Balaam himself is introduced speaking, he employs the name Jehovah, with a few exceptions which may all be reduced to one ground. Where He is spoken of, on the other hand, we generally find אֱלֹהִים, to indicate that Balaam stands in relation only to the Godhead, not to the living and holy God of Israel. So, for example, throughout the narrative of his dealings with the ambassadors of the Moabitish king, in chap. xxii. 8-20. This Elohim points to the fact that it was presumption in Balaam to boast of a nearer relation. The author places Jehovah in relation to Balaam only in that one prophecy, upon whose Jehovistic origin the whole meaning of the event rested.

Regarding Balaam as the author, this use of the name of God is quite unintelligible. And God is elsewhere expressly declared to be the author of the prophecies of Balaam. So, for example, in Deut. xxiii. 5: "Nevertheless the Lord thy God would not hearken unto Balaam; but the Lord thy God turned the curse into a blessing unto thee." But even in the absence of these external arguments, the prophecies themselves would bear evidence, not only because they reveal circumstances lying beyond the range of human knowledge, but still more by the living and deep conception of the idea, which places them on a level with the most lofty productions of prophethood, to which they are not inferior even in form.

The theme lying at the basis of all the four discourses is the blessing of the people of God, and especially the prediction of their supremacy over the world. The last of these discourses is again divided into four sections, distinguished by the *וַיִּשָּׂא מִשְׁלֵי*, and he took up his parable, which occurs altogether seven times, in harmony with the number of the altars erected by Balaam; cutting away beforehand all attempts to assume late interpolations, such as have been made by Bertholdt and Bleek. The double four and the seven are destroyed by these attempts. Only with the last discourse can we occupy ourselves at greater length. In the first three the idea appeared in a much purer form; in the last it had a special application. We have here a sketch of the whole fate of the people of God. They conquer all their enemies: Moab (the Moabites are named first because their attempt to subjugate Israel first called forth Balaam's prediction of the supremacy of the Israelites over their enemies), Edom, Amalek, and the Kenites—a Canaanitish people who are here named as the representatives of all the Canaanites because they lived nearer than any other to the place of the prophecy. Rapt by the spirit into the distant future, Balaam sees how a star rises from Jacob, a sceptre from Israel—both symbols of the kingdom which should emerge from Israel; and how this supremacy proceeding from Israel proves itself destructive to all that opposes it. This victory is followed by temporary humiliation. Asshur, including the Chaldean and Persian powers, which were developed out of the Assyrian, leads Israel into captivity. But the oppressors of the people of God are humbled by means of ships which come from the region of

Kittim, from near Cyprus, an indefinite name for that power which arose out of Europe to destroy the former Asiatic dominion, and was applied first to the Greeks and afterwards to the Romans. God arms the far West against the sinful East. He oppresses Asshur, the oppressor of Israel; oppresses also the land beyond the Euphrates, whose rulers (this is presupposed) resemble Asshur in their enmity against Israel. Destruction overtakes these enemies of the future as well as those of the present.

The history of Balaam now concludes with the words: "And Balaam rose up, and went and returned to his place; and Balak also went his way." A detailed account of the further course of his fate did not belong to the plan of the author, for whom Balaam has significance only in one aspect. He began by telling how Balak sent for Balaam to destroy Israel: he concludes with the way in which Balaam separates from Balak, without the latter having attained his wish. Yet we are able to fill out the story from isolated hints. Balaam prepared to return home after having uttered the prophecy. But his covetousness and vanity moved him to still further digression—to an attempt to gain that satisfaction which had been denied him on the part of the Moabites, by God's intervention, among the Israelites. We conclude that he went to the Israelites from the fact that there is no other way in which we can explain how Moses had such accurate knowledge of all that had befallen him. Moses probably treated him just as Peter and John treated Simon Magus. Angry, and deceived in his hope, he repaired to the enemies of Israel, the Midianites; for he did not venture to go back to the king of the Moabites, who had left him so wrathfully. The counsel which he gave the Midianites to destroy the Israelites, by seducing them to idolatry through sensuality, attests the depth of his earlier religious insight. Without this he would certainly not have been able to discover the only spot in which the covenant-nation was vulnerable. The counsel had apparently the highest success. A great number of the Israelites were led away. But God raised up Phinehas to be zealous for His honour; and just as the crime was checked in the midst of its course, so also was the punishment which had already begun. From the midst of the people there arose a powerful reaction

against the depravity—a prelude of that which has taken place among the people of God in every century; and after punishment has snatched away the guilty, the favour of the Lord returns to His church. The advice now recoiled upon the head of the seducers; and in the war of extermination undertaken against the Midianites, Balaam also met his death, for he still remained among them: Num. xxxi. 8, 16; Josh. xiii. 22. If the former event made Israel fully conscious that, if God be with us, no man can be against us, this one loudly exhorted them to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling: from without the election cannot in any way be nullified, but it may be so by the apostasy of the nation. Foolish is he who despairs of the mercy of God: foolish is he who attributes it to caprice.

The act of Phinehas, in Num. xxv. 7 ff., has frequently been falsely apprehended, and in this false conception has exercised an injurious influence. The zealots in the time of the war against the Romans appealed to his example. The judgment on the faithless was pronounced by Moses, the legal authority, ver. 5. The lawful rulers of the people, to whom the executive power belonged, had the best intention to perform their duty, but they lacked the requisite energy,—they wept before the door of the tabernacle of assembling, ver. 6. Then Phinehas stepped forward, who possessed what they lacked, and acted in their stead, as their servant and instrument. His act is rightly characterized in Ps. cvi. 30 as one of judgment; and those who would resist crime by crime have no pattern in him. The fact that the Israelites should have suffered almost no loss in the battle against Midian has given rise to suspicion. But it has been shown, in my treatise on Moses and Colenso, that the warlike men of the Midianites, in so far as they had not already fallen in the campaign against Sihon, sought safety in flight, so that it was not really a battle, but rather an execution.

The second giving of the law, and the renewal of the covenant on Sinai, form a worthy conclusion to the events in the plains of Moab; appended to which are earnest exhortations, warnings, threats, and promises, which at last culminate in the song of Moses and his blessing. The theme of the song of Moses in Deut. xxxii. is given in vers. 4, 5: the love and truth of God, the faithlessness and apostasy of the nation. Moses

foresees that the nation will fall into heavy sorrow and affliction in consequence of their apostasy. His aim is to take care that they are not led astray by their conception of God, but are led by it to repentance. He first describes the glorious deeds of God, then the shameful ingratitude of the people, then the affliction, which appeared now as a deserved punishment; and, finally, to protect the people against despair, the dangerous enemy of repentance, he points to God's saving mercy, which infallibly returns to His people after punishment. This song forms the key to the whole history of Israel, the text on which all the prophets comment, and to which they frequently refer even verbally; for example, Isaiah opens his first discourse with a reference to the piece.

The blessing of Moses, in Deut. xxxiii., begins and concludes in vers. 2-6 and 26-29 with an allusion to the basis and source of the blessing, the covenant relation in which Israel stands to the Lord since that exalted moment on Sinai. Then follow blessings on the separate tribes, which refer to particulars far less than is generally supposed. In general they are only individual applications of the blessing to be given to the whole nation, especially by the distribution of the land of Canaan, which here appears clothed with the enchantment of a hoped-for possession. The series begins with those tribes which were in any way distinguished: Reuben as the first-born; Judah, because in the blessing of Jacob he is destined to be the bearer of the sceptre; Levi, as the servant of the sanctuary; finally Joseph, on account of the distinction of his ancestor in Egypt.

Moses dies after he has surveyed the land of promise from Mount Nebo. No man knew his grave. According to Deut. xxxiv. 6, he was not to be honoured in a useless way, in his bones; but in a real way, in the keeping of the law which had been given through him. When we read, "And He buried him in the valley in the land of Moab," from what goes before we can only supply Jehovah as the subject. God's care for the corpse of Moses forms a counterpart to the condemnatory judgment by which he was shut out from the land of promise; and was at the same time a comforting pledge of His grace for the whole nation. But only the burial of Moses is spoken of; there is not a word to indicate that he was raised up before the resurrection; nor does this follow from Matt. xvii. 3, for

even Samuel appears without having been raised up. The idea of a raising up is rather opposed to the words, "The Lord buried him." In ver. 9 of the Epistle of Jude mention is made of a dispute between Michael the archangel and Satan for the body of Moses, in which Michael says, "The Lord rebuke thee." There we have little more than a commentary on the words of the Pentateuch. What Jehovah does for His people, He does, according to the Pentateuch, always by His angel or Michael; and when Jehovah wishes to do anything for His people, or for His saints, in the view of the Pentateuch, as given in Lev. xvi., Satan is always busy to prevent it. The means employed by Satan for this object, were the sins of the people and of their leader, as we learn from this chapter and from Zech. iii., to which there is a reference in the words, "The Lord rebuke thee." But the Lord does not desist on account of Satan's protest. He shows this by the fact that He is merciful and gracious, and of great mercy toward His own people.

There are still a few words to be said with reference to the chronology of this period. Respecting the duration of the residence of the Israelites in Egypt, we have two principal sources. In the former, Gen. xv. 13, in accordance with its prophetic character, the length of time is only determined in general, and is fixed at 400 years. We have a more exact determination in the properly historic passage, Ex. xii. 40: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years; and it came to pass at the end of the 430 years that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt." This passage says so plainly that 430 years elapsed from the coming in of the Israelites to their exodus, that it is scarcely conceivable how some chronologists have imagined that they could limit the time to 215 years without contradicting it. They have recourse to an interpolation, "first Canaan, and then;" but they gain nothing even by this forced treatment, since they are still opposed by "the children of Israel," which cannot refer to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Gen. xv. is also against them, where the whole residence in the strange land is expressly fixed at 400 years; for the passage does not refer to the whole period from Abraham to the return to Palestine, as Baumgarten thinks. Nor is anything proved

by Gal. iii. 17, which is appealed to as the foundation for these operations, and according to which 430 years intervened between the promise and the law; for we are not justified in accepting the first giving of the promise as the starting-point, but might much more reasonably believe that Paul regards the entrance into Egypt as the *terminus a quo*, the conclusion of the period of the promise. There is just as little definite meaning in the circumstance that in the genealogy of Moses and Aaron, in Ex. vi., only four generations are given from Levi to Moses. It must be assumed that some subordinate members in the genealogy are left out, according to a usage which is almost universal. The passage, Num. xxvi. 59, has been employed against such an abbreviation, where the words, "Jochebed, the daughter of Levi, whom her mother bare to Levi in Egypt," are understood of an immediate daughter of Levi. But this is arguing from our use of language to that of the Old Testament, which is essentially distinct. According to the latter, the words only imply that Jochebed was of Levitical descent. Amram, the head of one of the families of the Kohathites, which in the time of Moses already consisted of thousands of members, Num. iii. 27, 28, took Jochebed to wife, not in his own person but in one of his descendants, whose nearest name we do not know. She was not an actual daughter of Levi, but only belonged to his posterity; was a Levite whose origin went back to Levi only through a series of intervening members. When it is asserted that the ages assigned to Levi, Kohath, and Amram make it impossible to extend the sojourn in Egypt to 430 years, the fact is overlooked that it is not stated in what year each one begat his first-born; as is always done in the books of Moses when the genealogies are intended to carry on the chronological thread. The statement of age has therefore a purely individual meaning, and a chronological calculation cannot be based upon it. The age of the principal persons is given in a purely personal interest. We may remark in passing, that it is evident how little Egyptologists are to be depended on in Old Testament chronology, from the circumstance that Bunsen declares the 430 years to be far too short; while Lepsius, on the other hand, tries to reduce them to 90. This is evidently a sphere which admits only of hypothesis. We must adhere, therefore, to 430 years for the residence in

Egypt; and, if we add the 40 years of the march through the wilderness, we get 470 years. The ordinary chronology makes the entry into Egypt to have happened in the year of the world 2298; but this gives 60 years too many, falsely assuming that Abraham's departure from Haran only took place after Sarah's death, and overlooking the fact that this is narrated *per prolepsin*. The death of Moses is therefore placed in 2768.

SECOND SECTION.

HISTORY OF JOSHUA.

§ 1.

FROM THE DEATH OF MOSES TO THE CONQUEST OF JERICHO.

Moses was not permitted to lead his people into the promised land. Very shortly before his death he had consecrated Joshua, one of the heads of the people (Num. xiii. 2, 3), his truest disciple and help (Ex. xxiv. 13, xxxiii. 11; Num. xi. 28), to this office. When Joshua is called "the servant of Moses," this is not equivalent to his attendant, but rather his right hand, the man of action, as Moses was the man of counsel. Moses changed the original name Hosea into Joshua, the salvation of God, because he was to be the mediator of God's salvation to Israel. As a general and a reconnoitrer he had already given proofs of his resoluteness in the service of the Lord, of his wisdom and his courage; comp. Ex. xvii. and Num. xiv. His task was very clearly defined: he was to be the minister of divine justice to the Canaanites, and at the same time an instrument of mercy to Israel; for the possession of the land was the presupposition and fundamental condition of the complete realization of the preparation given to him by God through Moses. For the realization of this task there was no spirit equal to that of Moses in its independence, depth, and originality. But it also required what Joshua possessed, a spirit of unconditional surrender to the Lord and an energy sanctified by living faith.

The time to enter Canaan had now come. The first thing which the Israelites had to do was to cross the Jordan. If this were accomplished, it would be a matter of great importance for them to take the fortified town Jericho, because it was the principal fortress at the entrance of what was afterwards the wilderness of Judah, and opened up the way into all the rest of the country. According to Josephus, the city lay 60 stadia from the Jordan and 150 from Jerusalem. The surrounding country was an oasis in the midst of the wilderness, bounded on the east by the waste and unfruitful Valley of Salt, which lay north of the Dead Sea; and on the west by the stony, rocky wilderness. Surrounded by the first chalk mountain of the Judaic chain as by a continuous wall, and watered by rich springs, it formed a fruit-garden, in the time of Josephus, 70 stadia long and 20 wide, in which the choicest productions of the earth were cultivated.

The task of Israel was a very difficult one. The Canaanites stood at that time in their most flourishing condition. They were skilled in the art of warfare, had horses and chariots, and a multitude of fortified places. (The world now presents an analogy in the sphere of science.) Moreover, knowledge of the locality was in their favour; and Israel had nothing to place in opposition to all this, but their God and their faith. Only by these could they overcome the world. Joshua's greatness consists in the superiority of his faith over that of the nation—he set them an example.

After Joshua had been strengthened in faith by an immediate divine revelation (that mention is here made of an immediate revelation appears from the analogy of chap. vi. 2, where it is related how the Angel of the Lord appeared to Joshua), after he had exhorted the people, had told them of the coming passage over the Jordan, and had received from them the unanimous assurance of faithfulness, he made all necessary preparations for the passage, and for the attack on Jericho. He had already sent two spies from his camp to Jericho; for he combined human wisdom with the firmest trust in God. It is evident that the spies had been sent before Joshua told the people of the passage across the Jordan, which was to take place in three days; though many have maintained the contrary, from the fact that the business of the spies, who, according to

chap. xxii., only kept themselves concealed for three days in the mount of Jericho, could not have been accomplished in so short a time. After the spies had executed their commission, and had sufficiently ascertained the position and state of the city (that they did this appears from the account which they give to Joshua), they took refuge in the house of the harlot Rahab. Since very early times this has been a stumbling-block; hence every expedient has been tried to turn the harlot into an innkeeper. The Chaldee renders זונה by a word corrupted from the Greek πανδοκείτρια. And even Buddeus is not averse to this explanation. But it cannot be verbally justified; and there are no real arguments for the rejection of that which is verbally established. Above all we must maintain that Joshua, in choosing the spies, did not look only to subtlety, as Michaelis maintains, but at the same time to an earnest and pious mind. Like Moses, he never sacrificed the higher view to the lower; he never lost sight of the fact that the warfare which he waged was holy. But it is impossible to see why, for the attainment of their good object, the spies should have repaired to a house to which others resorted for sinful purposes. Whether hotels were at that time general, is very doubtful. It appears that in this sinful city houses of entertainment were all at the same time houses of bad repute: infamous houses had usurped the place of houses of entertainment; and even supposing that there were hotels in Jericho, they were not adapted for the aim of the spies. In the house of Rahab they might at least hope to remain unnoticed, for it was situated in a retired part of the town, immediately beside the town-wall, or rather on it, so that the wall of the town formed the back wall of the house. The argument which has been drawn from the fact that Rahab was afterwards received among the covenant-people, and gave proofs of a living faith, has already been excellently refuted by Calvin: "The circumstance that the woman who formerly sacrificed herself for the sake of shameful gain, was soon afterwards accepted among the chosen people, places the mercy of God in a clearer light, since it penetrated into an unchaste house, to save not only Rahab, but also her father and her brothers." Just as ill applied is the trouble which many have given themselves to justify the lie by which Rahab deceived the ambassadors of the king. Buddeus main-

tains that since Rahab, by her faith in the God of Israel, was incorporated into His nation, and was thus freed from her obligations to the king and the citizens of Jericho, who were in opposition to God's counsel respecting her, the king of Jericho had no right to demand the truth from her. But at the basis of this view lies a false theory of the duty of truthfulness. We should speak the truth, not because any one has a right to demand it from us, but because we are called to imitate God, who is a God of truth. There is, therefore, no doubt that Rahab made use of bad means for the furtherance of a good end. We cannot listen to arguments such as that of Grotius: "*Ante evangelium mendacium viris bonis salutare culpae non esse ductum.*" The other question is more difficult, whether Rahab did right in assisting the Israelites, to the injury of her native town. But here the question can only be *how*, not *whether*, the act is to be justified; for the faith of Rahab, and the act to which it gave rise, are commended in two passages in the Holy Scriptures, Heb. xi. 31 and James ii. 25. The remark by which Buddeus tries to justify Rahab against the former objection, applies better here. The belief that the God of Israel was the true God, that the possession of the town belonged to His people and would accrue to them, released her from obligations from which no human argument can ever release, since she was already spiritually accepted by this faith. Her act cannot be condemned unless the bestowment of the land of Canaan on the Israelites be regarded as an error. If this be established, she did nothing further than assent to the divine decree. In this, indeed, there might have been a mixture of sinful self-seeking, without which it might not have happened. As to the faith of Rahab, extolled by the apostles, Calvin has already well shown how it revealed itself. Fear of the Israelites, produced by the account of their wonderful passage through the Red Sea (comp. Ex. xv. 14 ff.), and by their victories over the kings beyond the Jordan, in which the Israelites had shown that the servile and cowardly spirit which they had brought with them out of Egypt had now quite left them (comp. Num. xxii. 2; Josh. ii. 10, 11), was common to Rahab with her people. But she differed from them in this respect, that while they made impotent resistance, she on the other hand grasped the only expedient, calm and joyful sub-

mission to the decree of God. Her people might conclude from what had occurred, the truth of which they could not deny, that the Israelites were favoured by a God of exceptional power; but she rises above these polytheistic notions: for her the God of Israel is the only and almighty Ruler of heaven and earth. Her companions put their trust in the strong and lofty walls of Jericho: Rahab in faith rises above the visible; she sees the walls already thrown down, the Israelites masters of the town. With reference to this narrative, we must remark in passing, that Luther is quite correct in his opinion that the spies were concealed under flax-stalks. The opinion of many, that the text refers to cotton, which ripens about the time at which the spies came to Jericho, and whose capsules were laid on the roof to dry, is now acknowledged to be erroneous; comp. Keil on Josh. ii. 6. They were flax-stalks (in those districts flax attains a height of more than three feet, and the thickness of a reed—hence tree-flax), which were piled up on the flat roof, to be dried by the hot sun-rays. The mountain in which the spies concealed themselves is probably that situated to the west, near Jerusalem, where none would look for them, because it lay deeper in the land. From here they could return in safety to Joshua, after the space of three days, when all search for them had been relinquished and they were believed to be far beyond the Jordan. Joshua now advanced with the Israelites to the Jordan. This happened, as we learn from chap. iii. 2, three days after the summons to the people to prepare for crossing the river. On the evening of the same day on which they arrived at the Jordan—and not, as Buddeus and others maintain, on the evening of the following day—the Israelites were instructed by the elders how they should act on the march. They were enjoined not to approach within a certain distance of the ark of the covenant. The object of this prohibition is expressly given in chap. iii. 4. The words, “for ye have not passed this way heretofore,” show Israel how very much they were in need of this guiding-star in a way which was quite unknown to them and full of danger. In this respect the ark of the covenant performed the same service for Israel as the pillar of cloud in the march through the wilderness, which had ceased to go before them since the time of Moses. “But if the nation had followed the ark on foot, then those

who were next to it would have so concealed it that those farther away from it would neither have seen it, nor have been able to recognise the way whither it led." Joshua further commands the people to sanctify themselves, because on the following day God will do great things among them. This consecration consisted first of all in outward ceremonies, in the washing of clothes, etc., comp. Ex. xix. 14. But it is clear that the proximate was not the ultimate, from the whole conception of God which is set up in the New Testament, according to which outward consecration can only be a symbol of that which is internal, and can only come into consideration as a means of exhorting to it. The passage took place, we are expressly told, at a time when the Jordan, otherwise comparatively easy to cross, was very much swollen, so that it filled its high bed, and even overflowed it, which is always the case in harvest time. The cause of this rising in the middle of April (for this is harvest time in Palestine) is probably not the melting of the snow on the high mountains of Lebanon and anti-Lebanon, but an emptying of the Sea of Tiberias, which reaches its highest level at the end of the rainy season: comp. Rob. ii. p. 506. Jesus Sirach also bears witness to this swelling when he says, chap. xxiv. 36, "Knowledge has come from the law of Moses, as the Euphrates and the Jordan at the time of harvest;" comp. 1 Chron. xiii. 15, where it is mentioned as an act of heroism that some had crossed the Jordan at this time. The accounts of later travellers are in harmony with this. Volney says that the Jordan towards the Dead Sea is in no part more than from 70 to 80 feet wide, and 10 to 12 feet deep; but in winter it swells to the breadth of a quarter of an hour (?). In March it is at the fullest. When Buckingham passed over the Jordan in January of the year 1816, the horses waded through without fatigue. Already, in February, he found a river near the Jordan, the Hieromax or Mandhûr, far broader and deeper than the Jordan in the neighbourhood of Jericho; which was 120 feet wide when it reached the Jordan, and so deep that the horses could scarcely wade through. On this point compare Robinson, ii. p. 502 ff., who strongly opposes the false notion that the Jordan with its waters covers the whole Ghor. But he is wrong in denying that the מלא על כל נדחתו in chap. iii. 15 means, it overflowed its banks: compare the parallel passage,

Isa. viii. 7, and Keil on this passage. The overflow did not extend over the whole breadth of the Ghor, but probably that part of the shore where there was vegetation, comp. Keil. How little the passage over the Jordan can be explained from natural causes, already appears from the fact that afterwards, even at the time when the Jordan was not swollen, it was no uncommon occurrence for whole bands of enemies to be drowned in its tides, when they had to pass over it on their retreat from Jerusalem, and missed its few fords. The great aversion of rationalistic interpreters appears from the remark of Maurer, that the river had probably before that time flatter shores and less depth. Indeed, we learn from Josh. ii. 7, that even in the time of the swelling the fords of the Jordan could be crossed by some at a venture, but for a whole army, a whole nation, these fords were of no avail. And the story of the miraculous passage could never have been formed and retained among Israel if a natural passage had been possible. The natural relations lay constantly before the eyes of the people, among whom faith in this miracle had the deepest root. The way in which the passage through the Jordan took place is thus given in ver. 16: As soon as the priests that bare the ark of the covenant touched the water of the Jordan, the waters which came down from above stood up, not in the place where the priests stood, but far higher, at a town called Adam, not otherwise known, situated on the same side as Zarethan, which was better known at that time: הָרְחֵק מֵאֵד בְּאֶרֶם הָעִיר אֲשֶׁר מִצַּד צָרְתָן, where the Masoretes try to read מֵאֵד instead of the בְּאֶרֶם which they misunderstood. The water of the lower part of the river now flowed upwards into the Dead Sea. Thus there arose a long, dry stretch, through which the Israelites could pass in very wide columns, and therefore in a comparatively short space of time. The priests did not remain standing on the near shore, as Buddeus maintains; but as soon as the water left the place where they first touched it, they stepped into the middle of the stream with the ark of the covenant, comp. ver. 17. There they served the whole nation for a northern bulwark, as it were, and did not leave this place until the whole passage was accomplished. We have still a few general remarks to make on the whole occurrence. It will not do to place it in the sphere of the impossible, for even the ordinary

course of nature presents analogies. It is known that in earthquakes, and even apart from these—as, for example, the Zacken in Silesia, or Zinksee—rivers and seas have frequently remained standing for a time, have gone back, emptied themselves, and dried up in a short space of time. This does not indeed explain our event. The drying up would not have taken place just when the bearers of the ark of the covenant set their feet into the river, and have continued just till the whole passage was accomplished, etc. Yet the analogy shows this much, that we need have no hesitation in assuming that, by an extraordinary working of divine omnipotence, a thing happened in this case which appears elsewhere as produced by an ordinary working of the same power, provided that causes can be proved worthy such an extraordinary working of God. And this is here the case in the highest degree. Everything was intended to bring to the consciousness of the Israelites the fact that they owed the occupation of the land, not to their own might, but only to divine power. In the justification of the miraculous passage through the Red Sea, the miraculous passage across the Jordan is also justified. The former, which had taken place forty years before, had already passed very much away from the eyes of the present generation. In the face of such great and manifold dangers, they were the more in need of being strengthened in faith, in proportion to the fewness of the manifestations of divine grace during the long period which had elapsed in the dying out of the sinful generation. The object was to show the nation that God's power was not limited to His instruments, that its operations had not ceased with the death of Moses. It was necessary to awaken them to confidence in their new leader, Joshua, in order to secure his efficacy. It was likewise necessary that the assertion of the Israelites, that God had given them the land of Canaan, should be confirmed in a solemn way. At the same time it was made impossible for insolent arrogance to excuse itself by their example. Only thus did the conquest of Canaan appear in its true light, as a divine judgment.

When the passage through the Jordan had been accomplished, Joshua sought to perpetuate the remembrance of the event by a twofold memorial. Twelve men, whom he had already chosen for this object before the passage (comp. chap.

iii. 12), had to bring twelve stones from the place in the middle of the Jordan where the ark of the covenant rested, and of these a monument was erected, chap. iv. 1-8. Twelve other stones were set up in the middle of the Jordan, in the spot where the priests had stood; perhaps piled one upon another in such a way that they were visible at low water-mark. Thus a new monument was added to those which had come down from the time of the patriarchs, and which the Israelites in their relation to God remembered now, immediately on re-entering the land after so long an absence—a herald which, if dumb, yet none the less loudly testified that heaven and earth were subject to the God of Israel; that Israel owed their land to this God alone, and could only retain possession of it by faithful adherence to Him; and to this, the new monument urgently exhorted. It is impossible to compute the influence which must have been exercised by the fact, that gradually almost every town in the promised land brought back to the memory of the Israelites the history of former times, by the remembrance of events which happened there, by its name, or by monuments. On all sides they were surrounded by testimonies of God's omnipotence and mercy, and of the faith of their forefathers. And just because the sacred historians recognised the importance of such a testimony, are they so careful to record the fact of any place in the promised land being hallowed in this way.

After the passage the army set up their camp in the place which was afterwards called Gilgal. Then Joshua undertook the circumcision, which had been neglected for so long a period. The cause of this omission is attributed to the fact, that Moses attached no great importance to circumcision, not to mention views which are wholly untenable, such as that of Bertheau; but the general opinion is this (comp. Clericus, Buddeus), that circumcision could not well have been performed, because they had no permanent abode, but were always obliged to break up when the pillar of cloud and fire gave the sign, and because the children, who were sick from circumcision, could not so easily be removed. But it is evident that this reason does not suffice to explain the omission, as Calvin shows very satisfactorily. However much the neglect might have been excused by circumstances, no inconvenience, no danger, could absolve

from obedience to so holy a command, which had been given to Abraham with the words, "The uncircumcised soul shall be cut off from his people," and the neglect of which, had threatened the lawgiver himself with death. Circumcision was the act by which membership in the covenant-nation was sealed, the basis of acceptance among the people of God, of participation in all their blessings. The assertion of Clericus, that circumcision was given up because it could not always be accomplished on the eighth day after birth, to which by the law it was unalterably attached, comp. Gen. xvii. 12, is refuted by the circumstance that Joshua now has all the Israelites circumcised, without distinction of age. From this it follows that the performance of circumcision on the eighth day was not so indispensable as circumcision itself, which is equally shown by the example of Moses' son. Again, this view rests on the utterly incorrect idea, that during the last thirty-eight years of the wandering the Israelites were continually on the march. We have already remarked, that during nearly the whole of this period they had their headquarters in the Arabah. Calvin has apprehended the right view. When it is said that all the people born in the wilderness are uncircumcised, the short period from the exodus out of Egypt to the sinning of the Israelites is left out of account. The consequence of this sin was the rejection of the whole generation then living—they were doomed to destruction. As a sign of this rejection, Moses would not suffer circumcision to continue; the fathers were strongly reminded of their sin when they saw that their children lacked the sign which distinguished them from the heathen. The objection which has been brought against this recently by Kurtz, viz. that God still gave the Israelites other tokens of His mercy that had not yet quite departed from them, such as the presence of the pillar of cloud and fire, the manna, etc., Calvin meets by comparison with a father who wrathfully lifts his hand against his son, as if he would drive him away altogether, while with the other hand he holds him back, frightening him by blows and threats, but yet not wishing him to leave his home. And now, on the entrance into the land of promise, immediately after God had again made Himself particularly known to Israel, the act was undertaken which restored to the people their dignity as a

people of God. It was a proof of living faith that Joshua and the people performed this act just at this time. This follows even from what has been said on the subject by a writer, who looks at the thing merely from the standpoint of natural, carnal wisdom. Bauer says, *Handb. d. Hebr. Nation*, vol. ii. p. 10: "It might have been expected that he would at once have fallen upon the terrified inhabitants; but instead of this, he occupies his army with religious ceremonies—with circumcision. During this whole time the nation was incapable of taking up arms and driving away the enemy. To what danger did Joshua expose himself and his people from holy zeal!" This must be partially conceded. The greatness of the danger appears from the narrative, Gen. xxxiv. Circumcision could have been done much more conveniently and safely before the passage over the Jordan. But, on the other side, it must not be overlooked that there was much which had lightened this struggle of faith to Joshua and the Israelites. They had just experienced God's miraculous power. How could they doubt that this power would protect them in a matter which they had undertaken at His command? It was not possible that God would take away beforehand the panic fear which had fallen upon the Canaanites, in consequence of the passage through the Jordan. This is expressly stated in chap. v. 1, in order to remove the incomprehensibility of Joshua's determination to perform circumcision. And Michaelis has observed that a part of the nation was already circumcised: all those who had been born before the ban was laid upon Israel, which only snatched away those who had been grown up at the time of the exodus from Egypt. This will teach us what estimate is to be placed on the views of Paulus and Maurer, who attack even the historical truth of the event by the remark: "The resolve to make the whole army sick at one time, and incapable of fighting, would have been impossible." The historical truth is confirmed not only by this narrative, and by the name of the place, whose legitimate derivation even Maurer is obliged to confess, but also by the great honour which Gilgal afterwards enjoyed as a place consecrated by the memory of former times, comp. Hosea iv. 15, ix. 15, xii. 12; Am. iv. 1, 4, 5, if we follow the prevalent view, according to which the Gilgal in the passages referred to is identical with

ours. Keil, in his Commentary on Joshua, chap. v. 9 and ix. 6, and on the Books of the Kings, Leipzig 1845, p. 323 ff., has combated this view. He has endeavoured to prove that our Gilgal occurs only in Micah vi. 5, where the prophet alludes to this event as well-established and universally known, that it never rose to a district, and that all other passages of the Old Testament refer to another Gilgal, in the neighbourhood of Mounts Ebal and Gerizim. But against Keil there is this argument, that there is no foundation for the sanctification of his Gilgal. In the conclusion of the account of the circumcision, chap. v. 9, we read, "This day have I rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you. Wherefore the name of the place is called Gilgal unto this day." These words have been very variously interpreted. The explanation most worthy of note is Spener's, *de legib. ritual.* i. c. 4, sec. 4, allowed by Clericus and Michaelis. According to them, the circumcised Egyptians despised the uncircumcised Hebrews. To take away the reproach, that it might no longer be cast at them. This view is untenable, because, even granting that circumcision had already been introduced among the Egyptians, the whole nation was not circumcised, but only the priests. How then could those who were themselves uncircumcised reproach others with neglect of circumcision? The true explanation has already been given on another occasion. The reproach of the Egyptians is unquestionably what put Israel to shame in the eyes of the Egyptians, giving cause for mockery; but this mockery did not extend to neglect of circumcision *in abstracto*, but to the special circumstances under which this neglect took place, regarded as a real declaration by God that He had rejected His people. The giving back of circumcision is looked upon as the restoration of the covenant, and thus a setting aside of the mockery which was based upon its abolition. In this sense mockery concerning the neglect of circumcision might proceed even from those who were not themselves circumcised. Soon after the circumcision the Israelites celebrated the passover also at Gilgal. This, too, had not been observed since the passover of the second year after the exodus out of Egypt, on Mount Sinai, Num. ix. 1, 2. Here also the reasons assigned by Clericus, Buddeus, and others, for the neglect are very insufficient. They suppose that the Israelites

had not enough of sheep. But the close connection in which the celebration of the passover-feast stands with circumcision in the book of Joshua points to another cause. We learn this more accurately from Ex. xii. 48, where it is said, "No uncircumcised person shall eat thereof." How, and why the keeping of the passover presupposes circumcision, we have already shown. Participation in the sacrament of the passover gave those who were members of the covenant-nation a pledge of the forgiveness of their sins of weakness. How then could the passover be celebrated when there was no longer any covenant, no covenant-nation, no covenant-sign? According to this, it is apparent that the passover was not kept during the thirty-eight years, and there can be no doubt whatever as to the explanation of the circumstance. On the sixteenth day of the first month, the day following the principal day of the passover, the Israelites began to eat of the new corn of the land. Hitherto they had eaten of the older stock. This day was, to wit, that on which the Israelites were obliged by the law to present to God the first ears of corn, Lev. xxiii. 9 ff. They were in this way reminded to regard all natural benefits of God as products of the land of promise, as covenant-gifts from God, whose continuance was dependent on that of the covenant, which was sealed to them through the passover. They were reminded of the duty to be grateful, to repay the blessing of the covenant by faithful adherence to it. This is the ground of the union between the natural and the historical sides of the passover.

Joshua then marched upon Jericho with his army. While he was there alone, probably occupied in deliberation how the town could best be attacked; almost despairing on account of the difficulty of taking a well-fortified town, defended by a numerous nation, with a people utterly ignorant of the tactics of besieging; praying to the Lord that he would be mighty in the weakness of His people, in an ἔκστασις he had a vision. An unknown man appears to him with a drawn sword, whom at first he takes for a warrior, as we learn from his question whether he is friend or enemy, but soon becomes aware of his more than human dignity. That he could not have regarded him as a common angel, but rather as the Angel of God κατ' ἐξοχήν—His messenger and revealer—is

most clearly shown by the circumstance that he calls himself the prince of the army of Jehovah—*i.e.* the prince and ruler of the angels, of the heavenly host of God, whose name Jehovah Zebaoth he bears—in contradistinction to the earthly one which Joshua commanded. The denotation has reference to Joshua's fears and embarrassments. The courage of the earthly general is raised by the sight and the word of the heavenly General, who, with all his host, will contend for him and with him. Moreover, he commands Joshua to put off his shoes, because the place where he stands is holy; and in chap. vi. 2 he is called Jehovah. There is no doubt that the speech of Jehovah to Joshua, given in chap. vi. 2 ff., was communicated to him by this angel-prince. For otherwise the apparition would have no object, the angel-prince would say nothing more than served as a preparation for a subsequent revelation, while he made Joshua acquainted with his person, and filled him with holy awe, thus securing the impression of the communications he was about to make. Even Clericus, who maintains that chap. vi. has reference to another divine revelation, is obliged to confess: *Mirum est angelum ad Josuam venisse sine ullis mandatis ullisae promissio.* This false notion is due to the circumstance, that it has not been observed that chap. vi. 1 only forms a parenthesis, which explains the contrast between the visible and the divine command—a firmly-closed town was to be taken by a mere ceremony. The fact that the Angel of the Lord appears with a drawn sword, and that he calls himself the commander of the army of God, points primarily to that which he intends to do with reference to Jericho, and then generally to that character of the activity of God, which was the prevailing one in the time of Joshua, to the problem which had to be resolved in those days, giving strength in the opposition which was then directed specially against the people of God. The Angel of God with the drawn sword is the fitting emblem of the time of Joshua. This vision, in connection with that recounted in the very beginning of the book, which was granted to Joshua while he was still beyond the Jordan, and which serves to supplement this, forms the counterpart to the call of Moses on Sinai, comp. Josh. v. 15—"Loose thy shoe from off thy foot," etc.—which agrees almost verbally with Ex. iii. 5, and serves to connect the two events. The shoes

are simply to be put off because they are dusty and soiled; and the artificial explanations of Baumgarten, Bähr, and Keil are already rejected, because the same custom of putting off the shoes before entering the sanctuary is found even among the heathen and Mohammedans, from whom the thought of "the impure earth lying under a curse," which was trodden with the shoes, is far removed. The following are the commands which the Angel of the Lord gives to Joshua, after the promises contained in his appearance and name: For six days the army is to compass the city in silence, and the seven priests who precede the ark of the covenant are to play on the trumpets. On the seventh day the same thing is to be repeated seven times. After this has been done for the seventh time, the people are to raise a loud war-cry. Then the walls are to fall in. The number seven points to the fact, that the whole thing rests upon the covenant of the Lord with Israel. Blowing with trumpets is a symbolic act, consecrated by the law. In Num. x. 9 we read: "And if ye go to war in your land against the enemy that oppresseth you, then ye shall blow an alarm with the trumpets; and ye shall be remembered before the Lord your God, and ye shall be saved from your enemies." According to this, the blowing with the trumpets was a signal by which the Lord's people showed Him their need, and besought His help—a symbolic *Κύριε ἐλῆϊσον*. And because the Lord Himself appointed this signal, just as certainly as they heard the sound of the trumpets so certainly might they believe that the Lord would come to their assistance. Calvin has already shown well what a great trial of faith this command was for the Israelites. To the carnal mind the thing must have appeared most absurd. It speaks in its latest representatives of "a tedious and ineffectual seven days' marching round." Carnal zeal must have led to impatience, since apparently nothing was done; carnal wisdom must have feared that the Canaanites, perceiving the foolishness of their enemy, and encouraged by it, would venture upon dangerous sallies. Because the Israelites followed the command absolutely, turning their gaze completely from the visible, and resisting all these temptations, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says truly, that the walls of Jericho fell down by faith. What Ewald observes with reference to this narrative, which in his opinion is traditionary,

applies much better to the event itself, viz.: "The inner truth, that even the strongest walls must fall before Jehovah's will and the fearless obedience of His people, has clothed itself in a palpable, external garment." The event was designed to impress this truth upon the minds of Israel for all time, the truth contained in the words, "By my God I leaped over a wall," and "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." Jericho has a symbolic signification. That which happened to the fortress commanding the entrance into the territory of the Canaanites, prefigured first of all what would universally happen to Canaanitish supremacy. In the walls of Jericho, at the last blowing of the trumpets, faith saw the overthrow of the Canaanitish power, which to natural reason was apparently insuperable. But if Jericho primarily represents the Canaanitish supremacy, it is also excellently adapted to be a type of the dominion of the world generally. We have even before us a speaking symbol of the victory of the church over all the powers of the world. The narrative has been falsely interpreted, as showing that all action on the part of Israel was absolutely excluded in the falling of the walls. We can infer only this, that the result of the action proceeded from God alone. For this reason the action itself is put quite into the background; but it is not denied by a single word. In the *πεσείται αὐτόματα τὰ τείχη* of the LXX. the *αὐτόματα* is a pure interpolation. If it had been the author's intention to say this, he would have said it more distinctly, as in ver. 20. It is natural to the pious, thankful mind to pay little attention to the mere human element. Here, indeed, it was insignificant throughout, for in this case all human hope of success was wanting, all natural conditions were absent. By divine command, the whole town was devoted to destruction, and in destruction, to God; what could not be destroyed (metal) fell to the treasure of the sanctuary, which is already mentioned in the time of Moses (Num. xxxi. 54), according to which a portion of the spoil taken from the Midianites was brought into the sanctuary, no part of the booty being given to the Israelites. Joshua pronounced a curse on any one who should build up the town again. This proceeding at the conquest of Jericho, so different from that characterizing the conquest of later towns—which Ewald in vain tries to reduce to a political reason,

in the spirit of J. D. Michaelis, and that a very shallow one—is explained in this way. We have already remarked, that the judgment on the Canaanites differed only from the Deluge and the judgment on Sodom and Gomorrha in this respect, that the latter took place immediately, and was totally destructive; while the former was indirect, and for the advantage of those who were the instruments of its accomplishment. This latter method caused the punitive judgment to be readily misunderstood; to guard against which misunderstanding, it was necessary that the destruction in the first conquered city should be complete. It was designed to serve as a lasting memorial of divine punitive justice. The former invariably represents the compulsory dedication to God of those who have obstinately refused to consecrate themselves voluntarily to Him: it is the manifestation of divine justice in the destruction of those who, during their existence, would not serve as a mirror for it. The curse pronounced on the Canaanites was in general directed only against those persons alone who properly formed the object of it. But in order to show that the earlier possessors were exterminated, not through human caprice, but through God's revenge, that their land and possessions did not come to the Israelites as a robbery, but only as a God-given loan, which He now again bestowed upon another vassal, to see if perhaps this one would faithfully perform the services to which he was bound, the curse on the first conquered place extended to the city itself, and to all possessions. Again, it was necessary to awaken the Israelites to a consciousness of the fact, that the whole possession which was given to them was only a gift of the free grace of God. And how could this be done more effectually than by God externally reserving to Himself His right of property in the first town? Finally, this also was for the Israelites a trial of faith and obedience. It must have been difficult for them, after such long hardship, to destroy the houses which offered them a convenient dwelling, and the possessions which promised abundant maintenance.

When Joshua lays a curse on him who would build up the town again, it is to be observed that to build a town is here equivalent to restoring it as such; fortifying it with walls and gates: for it is these which make a place a town in the Hebrew idea. Already, in the time of the Judges and of David, there

was another Jericho on the same site, which might be called a town in a wide sense: comp. Judg. iii. 13; 2 Sam. x. 5. Not until Ahab's time was the curse of Joshua literally fulfilled on Hiel, who, disregarding it, ventured to restore the town, 1 Kings xvi. 34. The arguments by which the fact that Joshua pronounced a curse on Jericho has been attacked in recent times, are self-condemnatory. It is said that the curse put into the mouth of Joshua bears a poetic character, as if this were not necessarily involved in the nature of the thing; and again, "It would have been unworthy a wise man to prevent his own people rebuilding a town in a place so well situated, near the fords of the Jordan,"—an opinion expressed by Paulus, and based on a total misapprehension of the power of religion on the mind, and of the spirit which animated Joshua, and which may be considered as a recognition of the higher life prevailing in Israel, as a *testimonium ab hoste*. Moreover there are events externally analogous even in heathen antiquity. Curses were also pronounced on Ilion, Fidenae, Carthage: comp. Maurer, *The Book of Joshua*, 1831, p. 60.

Rahab, with her household, was received into the covenant-nation. The statement in Josh. vi. 23, that she and her people were obliged to remain without the camp, refers only to the time before her change. She married Salma, an ancestral prince in Judah. Boaz was descended from them; and from Boaz and Ruth the kings of Judah; so that Rahab appears in the genealogy of Christ, the son of David after the flesh: comp. Ruth iv. 20 ff.; 1 Chron. ii. 11 ff.; Matt. i. 5, where Rahab is first mentioned.

§ 2.

FROM THE TAKING OF JERICHO TO THE DIVISION OF THE LAND.

These happy events were soon followed by a very sad one, equally adapted, however, to confirm Israel in the faith, since it brought to their consciousness the dangerous consequences of even the smallest violation of fidelity to God. One Achan,

called Achar in Chronicles—that the nomen may at the same time be an omen, comp. Josh. vii. 26, where the valley of the deed of Achan receives the name Achor, trouble—had stolen a portion of the spoil which had been consecrated to God by His own express command; and his guilt was increased by the circumstance that it was not stolen from want but through base covetousness; for we learn from a later account that he was a man of property, since his oxen, asses, and sheep were burnt with him, and all his possessions. We read, “The anger of the Lord was kindled against the children of Israel.” The fact that a crime committed by a single individual should have been imputed to the whole nation has proved a great stumbling-block. Calvin, on the other hand, appeals to the inscrutability of the divine decrees. “It is best,” he says, “that we should withhold our judgment until the books be opened, when the divine decrees, now obscured by our darkness, shall come forth clearly to light.” But in this instance there is not the slightest indication of any such absolute ἐπέχειν. The outward act of Achan was certainly an individual one, but the disposition from which it sprang was widely diffused through the nation: as human nature is constituted, it could not have been otherwise; and, in most cases, only fear of that God whose omnipotence and justice had been so palpably set forth, hindered it from manifesting itself in action. If the whole nation had been animated by a truly pious spirit, the individual would not have arrived at this extreme depravity. The crime of the individual is in all cases only the concentration of the sin of the mass. God cannot, therefore, be accused of injustice, if He visits an apparently isolated crime on the whole nation; but, at the same time, it is clear that pious long-suffering forbearance would in this and similar cases have been severity, not mildness. To visit the crime of the individual on the whole nation would tend powerfully to awaken their pious zeal. In this way the evil was stifled in its origin, and prevented from spreading. Each one watched himself the more closely, knowing how much depended on his own fidelity, while, at the same time, he watched others also. There is nothing easier, however, than by a counter-question to embarrass those who take exception to this, if they only acknowledge the operation of a special providence. How can

we reconcile with the justice of God the fact that the innocent must suffer with the guilty in public calamities, in plagues, war, and floods, in which even the heathen recognised divine judgments? In both cases the solution of the knot lies in the circumstance that the innocence is always relative. An opportunity was given for the expression of divine disapprobation in an undertaking against the city of Ai, concerning whose site investigations have recently been made by Thenius in the *bibl. Studien von Käuffer*, ii. p. 129. It is probably the present village Turmus Aja, in the neighbourhood of Sindjil, which occupies the site of the former Bethel. Externally considered, the loss of thirty-six men, which the Israelites suffered on this occasion, was very small and trifling. Nevertheless there was reason in the sorrow manifested by Joshua and the nation. For the Israelites, accustomed to recognise the finger of God in all that befell them, such an event had quite a different meaning from what it could have had for a heathen nation. God had promised His people constant victory; and from the fact that, in this case, the promise was not fulfilled, they justly concluded that God had withdrawn His favour from them. Hence they abandoned themselves to the most anxious solicitude respecting the future. Joshua at once adopted the right course. He turned to the Lord in earnest prayer. He fell on his face with the elders, and remained prostrate until the evening, praying and fasting. He did not indeed keep within suitable limits in his prayer, as Calvin has already remarked. True to human nature, he is inclined to seek the cause of the misfortune in God and His guidance. Instead of first looking into his own breast, he ventures to expostulate with the Lord, why has He led the people across the Jordan; and to express the wish that they had remained on the other side. But God overlooks this weakness, from which none of His saints is free; for He sees that the prayer proceeds from a true motive. Joshua shows himself more concerned for the honour of God, compromised by His people's disaster, than for the disaster itself. "Get thee up," God says to him, "wherefore liest thou thus upon thy face?" Not by sorrowing and supplication can the matter be set right, since the cause lies not in me, but in you. By stealing from the accursed, the curse has fallen upon the nation itself. The

nation can only free itself from participation in the punishment by a powerful reaction against participation in the guilt: they must show their horror of the crime by punishing the evil-doer. Measures are then given to Joshua for the discovery and punishment of the evil-doer, and are carried out by him on the following morning. The people are to purify themselves before they appear in God's judicial presence, a custom which could not fail to impress rude minds. First of all the tribes come before Joshua, then the families, then the households, and finally the individuals. The lot first falls upon the tribe, then the family, etc. It is uncertain whether the determination took place by lot or by the Urim and Thummim. The expression in 1 Sam. xiv. 42 is somewhat in favour of the former, so also the way in which it was managed; which, however, can also be explained if we suppose that the determination was made by the Urim and Thummim. The gradual progression was designed to cause great suspense among the nation, to make each one look into himself, asking himself the question, "Is it I?" In favour of the Urim and Thummim we have the fact that this was the customary means, appointed by God, of inquiring into that which was concealed—a means to which Joshua had been expressly referred; comp. Num. xxvii. 21, "And Joshua shall stand before Eleazar the priest, who shall ask counsel for him after the judgment of Urim before the Lord." If we decide in favour of the determination by lot, it is scarcely necessary to say that no universal justification of this mode of selection can be drawn from the circumstance. Joshua must, in this case, have had the definite promise that God would in this way reveal what was hidden. Without such a promise it would have been foolish and impious to leave the determination to lot. Achan remains hidden, doubting God's omniscience, like every criminal, until judgment singles him out. But then Joshua's truly paternal address brings him to confession,—a mighty proof for Israel how God's infallible eye looks into the most hidden things. Thereupon followed the punishment. Achan was first stoned, with his whole family, then burnt—for burning itself was never a capital punishment among the Israelites; finally, a great heap of stones was erected on the place of execution. Formerly theologians were very much perplexed by the fact

that Achan's sons and daughters were destroyed with him. Most critics—for example, Clericus, Buddeus, and others—agree in maintaining that it can only be reconciled with divine justice on the presupposition that Achan's children were conscious of and accessory to his crime. They appeal specially to Deut. xxiv. 16, "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin." But this passage is clearly inapplicable to our event. It has reference to those axioms which the rulers were to follow when left to their own method of punishment. Here, on the other hand, the matter is not left to Joshua's decision, but is regulated by God's immediate determination. To this case we might far more appropriately apply the declaration of God, that He would visit the sins of the fathers on the children to the third and fourth generation. In applying this decree we are doubtless led to a presumption of the participation of Achan's family in his guilt, in a certain sense; for this threat of the law, like all similar passages of Scripture, is only directed against such children as tread in the footsteps of their fathers: comp. Lev. xxvi. 39 ff., a passage which must be regarded as the best commentary. But the participation is not to be attached to the guilt, as something isolated, but to the sinfulness, of which this special offence was an individual expression. The fact that Achan's family were involved in his punishment presupposes that the apples had not fallen far from the branch; that they were closely connected with him in his sin. Without any inconsistency they might still have been perfectly innocent in the present case. Man, who can judge only the act, not the secrets of the heart, dare not have inflicted the punishment on them.

After the guilt had thus been turned aside from the nation, the march against Ai was at once undertaken. Here Joshua had recourse to a stratagem. In the night he sent out a detachment of the army, who were to go by a secret way, and lie in ambush west of the town, between it and Bethel. Much difficulty has here arisen from the fact that this ambush is given in chap. viii. 3 at 30,000, in verse 12 as 5000 men. The subterfuge to which most expositors resort is certainly unsatisfactory, viz. that Joshua sent out a double ambuscade.

For there could have been no object in this; since the 30,000 and the 5000 were sent to the very same place. Moreover, it is quite inconceivable how an ambuscade of 30,000 men together could have escaped the notice of the enemy, though this might readily be explained in the case of a smaller number, from the mountainous nature of the district. The true reconciliation is the following: At Joshua's command the whole nation prepared for the march against Ai. Joshua, however, does not wish all to go, but selects 30,000 men. Of these, 5000 are now sent as an ambuscade: with the residue he marches direct and openly against the city. The apparent discrepancy has arisen from the circumstance that the meaning is not clearly set forth in ver. 3. The author relates the command for the nightly departure, etc., as if it referred to the whole 30,000 men,—a want of precision of which he afterwards becomes sensible, and which he tries to remove by the supplementary account of the strength of the ambuscade. Joshua now marches against Ai in the morning with the remaining 25,000 men. The inhabitants of Ai, without any suspicion of the stratagem, advance to meet the Israelites; and when these retire in pretended flight, all who had remained in the city flock out. According to ver. 17, the inhabitants of Bethel also take part in the pursuit of the Israelites, which may probably be explained in this way: Many of those inhabitants of Bethel who were able to bear arms had resorted to the larger and stronger Ai, which was allied to them, or to which they were subject, in order by this means to meet the common enemy in a more effectual way than was possible while their active forces were divided. When the enemy found themselves at a suitable distance from the town, Joshua stretched out his lance towards Ai at the command of the Lord. Very unnecessary difficulties have here been made. Because it is said in ver. 19, "And the ambush arose quickly out of their place," it has been assumed that they broke forth at the stretching out of the lance as at a preconcerted signal. This has given rise to great embarrassment. The ambush was too far away to be able to see the outstretched spear. If it had been so near, the people of Ai must have been blind to have seen nothing of it. Here a multitude of expedients have been devised. Some substitute a shield for the spear, contrary to

all use of language; others suppose that a banner was attached to the spear, or, as Maurer and Keil, a shield plated over with gold; others again maintain that posts were placed between the ambushade and the army, by which means the ambushade was made aware that the preconcerted signal had been given: all arbitrary assumptions, and yet not satisfactory. There is not a word in the text which would lead us to infer that the stretching out of the spear was a preconcerted signal for the ambush. It is more natural to conclude from the account in ver. 26, that Joshua did not withdraw the outstretched lance until all the inhabitants of Ai were proscribed, that this symbolic action had quite another object. The outstretched lance was a sign of war and victory to the army of Joshua itself. It was quite natural that the ambush should break forth at the same time, if Joshua had before arranged with them that they should advance upon the town as soon as the enemy had withdrawn to a certain distance from it, which they could easily ascertain from the mountain heights behind which they lay hidden. After the city had been taken, the ambushade set fire to it. This, however, was done only in order to give the army a sign of the taking, and to deprive the enemy of courage. Otherwise the Israelites would have robbed themselves of the booty which belonged to them; for this case was not similar to the taking of Jericho. Joshua did not set fire to the whole town till the Israelites had possession of the spoil. In the account of the defeat of the enemy no express mention is made of the inhabitants of Bethel. We cannot, however, with Clericus, infer from this that they succeeded in saving themselves by flight. Doubtless they were included among the inhabitants of Ai, owing to their comparatively small number. But Bethel itself was not conquered until later by the Josephites, comp. Judg. i. 22-26. For at that time the only object was to take the most important points; conquest in detail was left to a later time. According to ver 28, Ai was made an eternal heap of ruins; but instead of the earlier town, which was destroyed utterly and for ever, a new place afterwards arose of the same name, mentioned in Isa. x. 28.

Joshua made use of this first opportunity for carrying out a decree which Moses had given to his people on his departure, Deut. xxvii. They were to write down upon stones,

plastered over with plaster, the whole sum of the law which Moses had declared to them, the quintessence of the Tora, which forms the germ of Deut. iv. 44—xxvi. 19. At the same time they were solemnly to pronounce a blessing on those who would keep this law, and a curse on those who should break it. Moses himself had fixed the place where this solemn act was to be performed. It was the region of Sichem, forty miles from Jerusalem, even now one of the most charming, most fruitful, and well cultivated districts of all Palestine and Syria; and, what was here specially considered, had been consecrated by the earlier history of the patriarchs. Here, according to Gen. xxxiii. 18, Jacob had first set up his tent for a length of time, when he returned from Mesopotamia. Here, full of gratitude for the divine protection and blessing, he had erected an altar and called it "The Mighty God of Israel." Here, before going to Bethel to make an altar to the God who had heard him in the time of his affliction, he commanded his people to put away the strange gods which they had brought with them out of Mesopotamia, and to purify themselves. Here they had given him all the strange gods that were in their hands, and he had buried them under the oak which stood near Sichem, Gen. xxxv. 1 ff. By the possession of Ai the way was opened to this holy city, situated north of Ai in what was afterwards the district of Samaria. The distance occupies about five hours, if Turmus Aja be identical with Ai. The narrative of the solemn event is short, because it presupposes the appointment in Deuteronomy. By a comparison of both passages the event was as follows: Sichem lies between two mountains, Ebal on the north, and Gerizim on the south. On the former Joshua caused an altar of rough stones to be erected, which had not been hewn with any iron tool; the first which had there been consecrated to the true God since the patriarchs had journeyed through Palestine. The reason why unhewn stones were taken for the altar is thus given by Calvin and others. According to the law of God, Deut. xii., there was to be only one national sanctuary in all Canaan, because multiplicity of places for the worship of God would interfere with religious unity and the development of a religious public spirit; and while hindering the expression of that united spirit, would give free scope to the *ἐθελοθρησκεία*, which passes so readily

from places to objects. This measure, therefore, tended to the advancement of God's worship. The place of the sanctuary was not yet determined, however; but it was already necessary that the places where the worship of God was provisionally performed should be characterized as subservient only to temporary necessity. Hence the altars were built only of sods, or of coarse, unhewn stone. But we learn that this reason is not the true one from that passage of the law which Joshua has in his mind, Ex. xx. 25 ff. There the people are commanded to make altars of turf before the erection of the tabernacle of the covenant, and afterwards on special occasions; when, for example, the ark of the covenant was taken to battle with them. "And if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone; for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it." These latter words contain the reason of the command. The object was to lead Israel to recognise that in relation to God they could not give, but only receive—not design, but only execute—to make them acknowledge that all they could do made the thing no better, but only worse. Understood in this way, the command comes into connection with the prohibition against making idols, which immediately precedes it. Both have their origin in the same source; or at least, the false element which gives rise to the worship of idols may very readily appear in the attempt to worship God in a self-devised system. Joshua then wrote a copy of the law which Moses had given to the children of Israel, on the stones prepared for this purpose. Josh. viii. 32 does not define more accurately what is here to be understood by the law of the Lord, but assumes that it is already known from Deuteronomy. It is self-evident that there cannot be a reference to the whole of the Pentateuch. Deut. xxvii. 8 gives the explanation, so that it is scarcely conceivable how some suppose that it has reference to the Decalogue; and others only to the curses which are pronounced in this chapter on the transgressors of the law. In ver. 1 Moses says to the people, "Keep all the commandments which I command you this day;" and again, in ver. 8, "And thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law very plainly." According to this, it comprised the whole series of doctrines, exhortations, threats, and promises, which had been uttered by

Moses on the day when the command respecting the monument was given. But the whole second legislation recorded in Deut. iv. 44–xxvi. 19 belonged to this day. This was properly the תורה for Canaan. The thorough distinction between the first and the second legislation is this: that the latter, given in sight of Canaan, is throughout adapted to the residence of the people in the country; while a reference to the relations during the march through the wilderness forms the foreground of the legislation in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. The design of the erection of these stones is thus given by Calvin: *Quando muti essent sacerdotes, clare lapides ipsi locuti sunt.* This is based on the presupposition that the stones were destined to exercise an influence on the after-world. But the mode and manner of the writing speak to the contrary. The plaster laid on the stones must soon decay when exposed to the air. The object probably referred primarily to the act itself or to its accessories, and to posterity only in so far as the thing was recorded in writing. The external establishment of the law symbolized the internal; the writing on stone exhorted the Israelites to their duty to write the law upon the tables of their heart. The whole brought the inner connection of covenant and law to the consciousness of the nation; pointing especially to the fact that the possession of the country into which they were now entering depended absolutely on the fulfilment of the law. Then followed the proclamation of the curse and the blessing. At the command of Moses Joshua placed six tribes on Mount Ebal, six on Gerizim, which lay opposite, and in the middle between the two the ark of the covenant with the priests and Levites. These read aloud, first the blessings, then the corresponding curses; the tribes upon Mount Gerizim responding “Amen” to the former, and the tribes on Mount Ebal to the latter. For example, the Levites first said, “Blessed be the man that maketh no graven or molten image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the hands of the craftsman, and putteth it in a secret place,” and all the people answered “Amen.” Then, “Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image,” etc., and all the people answered “Amen.” Thus they were obliged to declare themselves guilty of that divine punishment whose fearfulness they had just had an opportunity of learning by the example of the Canaanites, if they

transgressed the conditions of the covenant. The reason why the people standing on Mount Gerizim responded "Amen" to the blessings, and the people standing on Mount Ebal to the curses, has frequently been sought in the natural condition of the two mountains,—one being covered with vegetation, the other desolate and bare. But this distinction is problematical, and exists now only in a very slight degree; comp. Robinson, iii. p. 316. The reason adopted by Keil is much more probable, viz., that Gerizim owed its selection as the place of blessing to the circumstance that it lay to the right of the Levites, comp. Matt. xxv. 33. When the ceremony was concluded Joshua read out the whole contents of the document which was written upon the stones.

Joshua then returned to the camp at Gilgal with the army. The Israelites were still to remain together, in order to break the power of the Canaanites. Not until this happened did it become the task of the separate tribes to put themselves in full possession of their inheritance. Until then the camp at Gilgal remained the proper headquarters of the Israelites. According to Keil, the Gilgal here mentioned is not identical with the encampment of the Israelites mentioned in chap. iv. 19, but was situated in the neighbourhood of Bethel and Ai. But when the camp at Gilgal is mentioned without any nearer determination, we naturally think of the Gilgal already familiar from the earlier narrative. The name Gilgal stands in such close connection with the event previously recorded, that the arguments for the existence of a second Gilgal must be stronger than they are in fact. The Israelites' fortune in war at last began to arouse the Canaanitish princes and peoples from their sloth, and to incite them to take common measures. The inhabitants of Gibeon only drew a different lesson from what had occurred. This was a mighty town, north-west of Jerusalem,—according to Josephus, forty stadia distant from it; under David and Solomon the seat of the tabernacle of the covenant; now the village el-Djib, which is a mere abbreviation of Gibeon. According to Robinson, part ii. p. 353, it was two and a half hours' journey from Jerusalem. The Gibeonites regarded the weapons of the Israelites as invincible, and all resistance as foolishness: hence they sought to secure the preservation of their life by cunning. Some—for example, Clericus and Buddeus—have supposed that this cunning of the Gibeonites was quite

unnecessary, and had its origin in their false ideas. Nothing further was necessary than that they should voluntarily submit to the Israelites. Their lives would then have been spared without hesitation. But this view is distinctly erroneous. It is already refuted by the narrative itself; for how then could Joshua have been blamed, as in chap. ix. 14, for having been deceived by the cunning of the Gibeonites into precipitately granting them their lives? Or how could the people and the elders have murmured against Joshua on this account, as they are said to have done, in ver. 18? But all doubt is banished by the plain passages, Ex. xxiii. 32, 33, xxxiv. 12-16, Deut. vii. 1-5, in which the Israelites are expressly forbidden to receive the Canaanites by treaty as subjects or even as serfs. Add to this the passages in which it is declared that Israel should accomplish the judgments of divine righteousness on the Canaanites, and should destroy them. If this were the case, it made no difference whatever whether they surrendered or offered resistance. So also the passages in which "That they teach you not to do after all their abominations," is given as a motive for Israel not to spare the Canaanites: comp., for example, Deut. xx. 18. This consequence must apply equally to those who voluntarily surrendered. The arguments against this view may easily be set aside. Appeal is made to the fact that it is expressly appointed, in Deut. xx. 10, that when a town is about to be besieged, peace shall first be offered to it. If this peace be accepted, the inhabitants are to be spared, and subjected only to tribute. But the passage proves the very contrary. In ver. 15 it is expressly stated that the decree has reference only to foreign enemies; and its false application to the Canaanites is expressly contested in verses 16-18, and their complete extermination commanded; which, if the Israelites fulfilled their mission, they could escape only by flight and emigration. Appeal is also made to Josh. xi. 19, 20, where we read, "For it was of the Lord to harden their hearts, that they should come against Israel in battle, that he might destroy them utterly, and that they might have no favour, but that he might destroy them, as the Lord commanded Moses." But Michaelis has justly remarked, *Mos. Recht*, i. § 62, that the author only means to say that the Israelites would perhaps have been more merciful than the law if the Canaanites had begged for peace, and would have

granted them what Moses had forbidden them to grant. There is no doubt, therefore, that the Gibeonites acted wisely when they sought, by cunning and deceit, to gain from the Israelites an assurance that their lives would be preserved. We only observe, that it seems to follow from the narrative that Gibeon had been a free town, exercising a kind of supremacy over three other towns situated in that district, viz. Kephira, Beeroth, and Kirjath-jearim; a relation which we find elsewhere subsequently in the book of Joshua, for we read of towns with their daughters. In the whole narrative there is no mention of a king, but only of elders of the town; and these seem to have been invested with supreme authority. Moreover, Gibeon is not to be found in the list of the thirty-one royal towns of the Canaanites, chap. xii. 9-24. Perhaps this constitution may have been the concurrent cause why they did not unite with the other towns against Israel. The question has here been raised, whether the Israelites were under an obligation to keep the oath given to the Gibeonites. This may very plausibly be contested. The treaty with the Gibeonites was concluded on the basis of their declaration, and on a presumption of its correctness. Calvin remarks: "*Cum larvis pascitur Josua, nec quidquam obligationis contrahit, nisi secundum eorum verba.*" But the sanctity of an oath is so great, that where any uncertainty remains it is always better not to dispense with it. The treaty had been made by Joshua and the elders unconditionally, and without the stipulation that it should only hold good hypothetically. In chap. ix. 19 they say, "We have sworn unto them by the Lord God of Israel; now, therefore, we may not touch them." Joshua did everything, however, which lay in his power to guard against the injurious consequences of this rash step. He did not allow the Gibeonites to retain their independent existence, lest in this way the town should prove a mighty and seductive seat of idolatry. The town was given to the Israelites. The Gibeonites were made slaves, and were specially appointed to the lower service of the sanctuary. In after time we find them always in the place of the sanctuary, or in the cities of the priests and the Levites; consequently in places where they could not so readily exercise an injurious influence, and where they themselves had an opportunity of learning the fear of God. The נתינים consisted princi-

pally of these—the devoted, or servants of the sanctuary. In the distribution of the land their city was assigned to the tribe of Benjamin, but was afterwards made a town of priests and Levites. Nor does the whole event rest solely on the testimony of the book of Joshua, but is also corroborated by the 2d book of Samuel, chap. xxi., where the Gibeonites complain that Saul broke the oath sworn to them by Israel. Under the pretext of religious zeal, Saul, in the interest of his covetousness, had instituted a slaughter of the Gibeonites. The voluntary surrender of the town of Gibeon was indirectly the cause of the speedy subjection of the whole subsequent territory of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. It accelerated the union of the kings of this district, of whom the king of Jerusalem is named as the mightiest king of the ancient capital of the Jebusites, already mentioned in Genesis under the name of Salem. It is remarkable that this king bears the name Adonizedek, almost the very same as Melchizedek. It appears also to have been the custom among the Jebusites, what we still find among most nations of the ancient East, that the names of the kings were more hereditary titles than proper names. The fact that the allied kings are, in Josh. ix. 1, called “the kings beyond the Jordan,” is explicable by the circumstance that the Israelites had not yet gained a firm footing in the country on this side of the Jordan; and hence they still retained that designation which properly only applied to them so long as they had not yet crossed the Jordan. The attack of the allies was first directed, not against Israel, but against Gibeon, which had been faithless in their eyes. Joshua, made aware of it, immediately hastened to the assistance of the besieged. He made a journey of from eight to nine hours in the night with his army, and arrived before Gibeon early in the morning. The first battle that Israel fought in Palestine resulted in their favour. The enemy were totally defeated. The fugitives fled towards the south, with the intention of gaining their fortified towns. Beth-horon is named as the first town to which the Israelites pursued them. According to Josh. xvi. 3, 5, 1 Chron. viii. 24, there were two Beth-horons, an upper and a lower. Our narrative is in unison with this. It speaks of a way up to Beth-horon, and of a way down from Beth-horon. Upper Beth-horon lay on the top of the slope; Lower Beth-horon at the foot of it. Both places are still in existence,

under the name of Beit-ur. They are small villages, but have considerable foundation-walls. The pass between the two places, which was called the ascent as well as the descent from Beth-horon, has also been discovered by Robinson : see part iii. p. 273 ff. From thence the enemy fled to Azekah and Makkedah, more southern than Beth-horon—the former about parallel with Jerusalem, and west of it; the latter somewhat lower down. The narrative now goes on to say, chap. x. 11 : “And it came to pass, as they fled from before Israel, and were in the going down to Beth-horon, that the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died.” Isaiah alludes to the event here narrated in chap. xxviii. 21. After the example of others, especially of Masius and Grotius, the French Benedictine, Calmet, in his treatise “On the Stone-rain which fell upon the Canaanites,” in his *Biblical Researches*, translated by Mosheim, part iii. p. 53 ff., has, with much learning, tried to defend the opinion that an actual stone-rain is here referred to. On the other hand, by far the greater number understand by the stones a hail of unusual size, which, being violently driven by the storm, killed a number of the Canaanites. Jesus Sirach, chap. xlv. 6, is of this opinion; so likewise the LXX., Josephus, and Luther, who, after the precedent of the λίθος χαλάζης of the LXX., translates “large hail” instead of “large stones.” There can be no doubt that this latter view is the correct one. The author himself explains what kind of stones he means when he says, immediately after, “they were more which died with hailstones, אבני הברד, than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword.” This alone is sufficient proof. Calmet here seeks to avail himself of the assumption that hail-stones stands for a hail of stones. But there is not the slightest confirmation to be adduced in favour of this strange interpretation. On the contrary, it can be shown from other passages, Ezek. xi. 13, 11, “that the Hebrews were accustomed to call hail, hailstones or simply stones.

An actual miracle did not, therefore, occur here. The fact that the hail happened just at this time with such destructive power, and that it fell upon the fleeing enemy, not touching the Israelites who pursued them at some little distance, verges upon the miraculous. In this way the Israelites were made to feel that they gained the victory not by their own power,

but by that of God, who alone made their weapons victorious; while their enemies were taught that their misfortune was due not to human error, but to the judgment of God.

After what we have just related, the narrative goes on to say, in chap. x. 12-15, "Then spake Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon; and the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day. And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man: for the Lord fought for Israel. And Joshua returned, and all Israel with him, unto the camp to Gilgal."

We shall first notice the various opinions respecting this passage. They may be reduced to four.

1. In ancient times by far the greater number of its defenders held the opinion that the whole passage must be understood in a strictly literal sense, that the sun stood still at Joshua's command, and that there was therefore a double day. The oldest author in whom we find this view is Jesus Sirach. He says, chap. xlvi. 5, "By his means the sun went backwards, and one day became two"—*μία ἡμέρα ἐγενήθη πρὸς δύο*. Following this view of the passage, Buddeus afterwards makes it the basis of an argument against the Copernican system. The best collection of the arguments for this view, next to that of Buddeus, may be found in Calmet, l. chap. iii. p. 1 *sqq.*, and in Lilienthal, *The Good Cause of Divine Revelation*, part v. p. 154 ff., and part ix. p. 296 ff.

2. Others take essentially the same view, but are inclined to the opinion that the earth and not the sun stood still, or at least maintain that the contrary cannot be concluded from the passage in question. So, for example Mosheim, in his *Remarks on Calmet's Essays*, to which we have already alluded, p. 45, observes, that in ordinary language all natural things are not spoken of as they are in fact, but as they appear to the eyes and to the senses. And, in a certain sense, this mode of speech is correct, in so far as things are spoken of as they appear to the

whole world. Even scholars have neither the wish nor the power to depart from this mode of speech in common life, since they say, for example, "The moon shines," although it has no light of its own, but only a borrowed light; and they say, "The sky or the air is blue," although it only appears so to our eyes, and "The sun rises and sets," etc. Scripture must, therefore, necessarily accommodate itself to ordinary modes of speech, if it would be understood by the majority of those for whom it was written, and not, forgetting its object, enter into physical deductions, thereby turning its readers aside from its design. But we cannot therefore assume that Scripture sanctions error; just as it would occur to no one to accuse a natural philosopher of error, because he conformed to the ordinary use of language. Thus the Jewish nation, with all others, believed that the sun moved round the earth. And supposing that this view is based upon an error, which is by no means proved, yet Joshua would have been unintelligible, and have made himself ridiculous, if he had commanded the earth to stand still.

3. Others are of opinion that unusual appearances took the place of the sun and moon in the eyes of the Israelites, after these had ceased to shine; and that this phenomenon is so clothed in half-poetical description, as to make it appear that the sun and moon themselves remained standing in the heavens beyond the usual time. It may readily be conceived that this class includes a variety of different opinions, since free scope is given to arbitrary imagination, leaving us at liberty to investigate the whole region of luminous phenomena, and to select from them at will. Thus Michaelis holds that the storm was followed by universal lightning, which lightning enabled the Israelites to pursue the enemy, and prevented the Canaanites concealing themselves anywhere, or gaining a footing. Spinoza thinks that the rays of the setting sun were refracted in the hail. Clericus supposes refractions, such as those by means of which the sun may be seen above the horizon, beyond the polar circle, although still in reality below it. And there are still more hypotheses of this nature.

4. Others take the whole description throughout as poetical and figurative. Vatablé, professor in Paris at the time of the Reformation, seems to confess to this view when he thus paraphrases the prayer of Joshua: "Lord, suffer not the light of

the sun and the moon to fail us, until we have completely conquered our enemies."

If now we proceed to examine these different views, it soon becomes evident that the third, in all its modifications, is untenable. Granting that the author of the book speaks in this passage, we must understand everything precisely and literally. For, in harmony with the homely character of his hero, he employs throughout a simple, historical representation, free from all rhetorical adornments and exaggerations. It is therefore absurd to suppose that in this sole instance he acted out of his character, and disfigured the simple course of the event by his representation. But it is equally absurd to maintain, with Spinoza, that Joshua and his whole army, and likewise the author, were deceived through ignorance of natural science, and took the appearance of a parhelion, or something similar, for the continued light of the sun. Such a deception is certainly without a parallel; even a child would readily distinguish between the two. If, on the other hand, we assume that the author only quotes the words of another, and that of a poet, all reason for this view disappears. There is therefore no cause for assuming a special phenomenon of nature. Only a want of acquaintance with the bold imagery of Oriental poetry can suppose that there is any necessity for such an historical basis. In this case the fourth explanation is unhesitatingly to be preferred. Compare the eighteenth Psalm, where David's victory over the enemy is represented under the image of a fearful storm; compare also the Israelites' song of victory after their passage through the Red Sea, Ex. xv.; Deborah's song of praise in the book of Judges, chap. v., where, according to ver. 20, even the stars in their courses fought against Sisera. Compare also the many highly poetic passages in the prophets, for example in Habakkuk, especially chap. iii.; and it must be conceded that this passage is surpassed in boldness by many even in Scripture. Some, indeed, have disputed the fact, maintaining this or that among the passages indicated to be somewhat less figurative than the one in question—that the stars, for example, having become obscured, were probably in reality a concomitant cause of the victory over Sisera; but such a proceeding is as unpoetic as possible. Nowhere in the canonical books of Scripture has the image such an external limit. Recall, for example, how, in

Isaiah, the fig-trees are represented as clapping their hands for joy on account of Israel's pardon; the ruins of Jerusalem break forth into shouting; in Joel, the mountains flow with milk, etc. There would only be reason for protesting against the figurative conception if an incongruity could be proved between the image and the object, if the image and the thing were not one in essence. This is the only demand which can be made in this respect on the sacred writer, and we shall prove hereafter that it is perfectly satisfied by a figurative conception of the passage.

From these remarks relative to the third view, it follows that, in order to determine whether the first or second (in this discussion to be regarded as one), or the fourth interpretation is to be regarded as the correct one, everything depends upon whether the passage contains the words of the author or not. For, in the former case, all must acknowledge that the author of our book really was persuaded of the fact that the greatest of all miracles took place; and those who also acknowledge the divine authority of the Old Testament must believe that the thing did actually take place. In the latter case only a love of the marvellous, counteracting the natural aversion to miracles, could insist upon a strict literal apprehension.

That a portion of the passage does not proceed from the author, but is taken from an old poem, is beyond doubt. In ver. 13 the author even quotes the *Book of the Just*, ספר הישר; and that this was a poetical book follows partly from the fact that, in 2 Sam. i. 18, it is mentioned as containing David's lament over Saul and Jonathan. In all probability it was a collection of songs, composed at different times, in praise of pious heroes, or pious men who were very distinguished. The true theocrats are elsewhere termed ישרים, comp. Num. xxiii. 10; and Jeshurun occurs in the song of Moses as a designation of Israel. But the further question is, whether that which follows after the quotation is also taken from this collection of songs, or whether they are the words of the author of the book himself. In the latter case the miracle would still remain undisputed. But since historical truth may be contained even in a poem, it would follow, from the fact that the author relates it in homely prose as history, that the author of the poem in this case also kept simply to the historical truth. There is certainly one argument which speaks for the fact that only

ver. 12 and the beginning of ver. 13 are taken from the book named. In general, the words which state that there is a quotation in a passage, are not placed in the midst of the words quoted, but either before or after them. But since rules of this nature are not so binding as not to leave something to the freedom of the author; since most analogies which are appealed to, the citations in the books of Kings and Chronicles, are of quite another sort, and cannot be compared with our case; since no verbal quotation of passages from other writings is to be found in them, comp. the details by Keil; since an analogy for the position of the words may be adduced from the prophetic writings, where "Thus saith the Lord" appears innumerable times in this way; it follows that the argument *ceteris paribus* can only prove something when it is not outweighed by other stronger arguments to the contrary.

But, if we examine closely, it appears at least most probable that the whole passage is interpolated from the song. First, we point to the fact that if the author had wished to relate a real miracle, he could not have done it in this place. This miracle must have occurred at Gibeon. But the author only inserts the words, "Then spake Joshua," etc., when he has already told how Israel came to Azekah and Makkedah in pursuit of the fleeing enemy. This circumstance admits only of one explanation. The author first describes the events as historian; then he gives a simultaneous poetical sketch of the same events, just as Moses did in Num. xxi. 14-17, 18-27 ff. Again, the defenders of the miracle overlook the fact that Joshua not only desires the sun to stand still at Gibeon, but also the moon in the valley of Ajalon; and this can scarcely be understood otherwise than poetically (comp. later). But the verse which forms the conclusion of the whole passage, "And Joshua returned, and all Israel with him, unto the camp to Gilgal," comes especially into consideration here. If we attribute this passage to the writer, we do not know how to deal with it. It is impossible to believe that Joshua at that time really returned to Gilgal with the whole army. The author continues in ver. 16 just where he has left off in ver. 11. He narrates circumstantially how Joshua followed up the victory, and how the army undertook a campaign into the southern region, still farther distant from Gilgal, and conquered the cities of the

hostile kings. Not till ver. 43 are we told how Joshua returned to Gilgal after he had subdued the whole territory of the hostile kings. Three subterfuges have here been employed, all equally inadmissible. Some, such as Calvin and Masius, represent the verse as spurious, though we are unable to perceive how it could occur to a glossator to insert it here, in so unsuitable a place. If the verse be already omitted in the LXX., at least in the oldest *codd.*, the Vatican and Alexandrian, taking into consideration the usual character of the translation, the circumstance proves nothing further than that the translator felt the difficulty no less than later expositors. Others, for example Buddeus, try to explain the passage in a less violent way by a different interpretation. They translate, "Joshua already intended to return to Gilgal." Joshua is represented as having had the intention of returning, but as having altered his determination when he heard that the five kings were concealed in the cave at Makkedah. Verbally, nothing can be objected to this interpretation. The *שוב* with *אל* betokens in itself not the desired goal, but only the turning towards it. But it is scarcely conceivable that Joshua had already the design of returning, and had begun to carry it out. Could it have entered his mind to rob himself of all the fruits of his victory by a precipitate retreat to Gilgal, and not to avail himself of the excellent opportunity which was here given him to occupy the whole of the enemy's country, which he would afterwards have been compelled to do with infinitely greater exertion and danger? Moreover if the words, "And he returned," were intended to denote merely intention and beginning in contrast to performance, this must necessarily have been expressly noted in what follows, which is not the case. Add to this, that in ver. 43 the same words are literally repeated; and if they are there to be understood of an actual return, another interpretation of this passage can scarcely pass for anything but an inadmissible shift. Others again appeal to the insufficiency of Oriental historiography. The author, they think, at first intended to conclude his whole narrative with ver. 15. Then it occurred to him that he had still to record some not unimportant circumstances. These, without consideration, he joined to that which went before, where we should insert, "But previously that which follows happened." This view is also inadmissible. How is it

conceivable that it could have been the author's first intention to pass by in silence the whole contents of vers. 16-43? For his object, this is just the most important thing. The battle is of importance to him only as a means of obtaining possession, which is properly the subject of his book; and there is not a word before ver. 16 of the other great consequences of the victory, of the subjection of the whole southern half of Palestine. Moreover the poetical character is not only unmistakeable in ver. 12 and the first half of ver. 13, but also in the second half of ver. 13 and in ver. 14. Even Masius acknowledges this, although he adheres to the current idea. He says: "There can be no doubt that the words, 'So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day,' are rhythmic, and are taken from the *Book of the Just*. The whole mode of expression and construction shows it most clearly." On the other hand, appeal is made to the fact that ver. 15 has nothing poetical about it. But this is not at all necessary, since analogies, such as that of Ex. xv. 19, show that it was not unusual to give songs glorifying the mighty deeds of the Lord, a prosaic conclusion closely connected with them. The fact that this verse is repeated almost word for word in ver. 43 proves nothing. The author of the book intentionally makes use of the words of the poetic passage he had previously quoted.

We only remark further, what would certainly not in itself be a sufficient proof, that the miracle of a standing still of the sun, alleged to have been performed by Joshua, is nowhere else mentioned in Scripture; that the prophets, whose writings are completely interwoven with references to the histories of previous times, in which they saw more than dead facts, in which they saw just so many prophecies of the future, have not a syllable respecting it, nor have the psalmists, who frequently make God's mercy in past times the theme of very long disquisitions; and in all the New Testament, with its numerous allusions to the mighty deeds of God under the Old, we find nothing of this miracle. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in his representation of the effects of faith under the old covenant, also makes no reference to it, although he mentions the act of Rahab, the destruction of the walls of Jericho, etc. Attempts, indeed, have been made to

find a reference to this event in one passage of the Old Testament, Hab. iii. 11; but it is only possible to do so by an offence against the laws of language. The passage is translated, "Sun and moon stand still in their habitation;" but the *שָׁמַשׁ יָרָה עִמָּר וְכֶלֶה* can only mean, "they stand towards their habitation," they repair to their habitation, and there remain still. The setting of the sun and moon is poetically represented as their withdrawal into their habitation. The symbols of divine grace no longer shine with a friendly light; the fearful darkness which has arisen is now illuminated by another light, the lightning, by which God destroys His enemies. The passage is parallel to those numerous other ones in the prophets, in which the sun and moon are represented as dark before and during the manifestation of divine judgments. Isa. xiii. 10: "For the stars of heaven, and the constellations thereof, shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine;" comp. Joel ii. 10, iv. 15 (3, 4); Amos viii. 9. From this it is clear, that the passage in Habakkuk contains exactly the contrary of that which is said to be recorded in Joshua. Here the sun and moon remain beyond their time; there they set before their time.

But the defenders of the historical conception assert that, if the author had wished the quoted poem to be understood figuratively, he must expressly have said so, otherwise the reader must necessarily come to the conclusion that the quotation contains pure historical truth. But the question is whether the connection does not involve an actual declaration, which is equivalent to a verbal one. The author details the actual course of events in vers. 8–11, up to a point of time which goes beyond that in which the event of vers. 12–14 occurs. The enemy is already conquered, and far advanced in flight. And when the author now interrupts his narrative, returning to the time of the battle in order to give another account of it from a poetical book, the natural, self-evident conclusion is, that this account gives no new historical particular, but is only intended as a repetition, in a poetical form, of what had been previously given in a historical form; and the author shows this plainly enough by the fact, that on beginning the history again in ver. 16, he connects it immediately with ver. 11, where the

history left off. Compare the וַיִּנָּסוּ in ver. 16 with the וַיִּהְיֶה in ver. 11. It must not be overlooked, however, that the poetical representation differs from the historical only in form. It is essentially the same whether God lengthened one day into two, or whether He did in one day the work of two; the expression of mercy towards Israel is equally great. But just because the carnal mind is so slow to recognise this, the more palpable form is substituted for that which is less apparent to the sight; as in Ps. xviii. David represents his enemies as destroyed by a storm, in order to show that he recognises the concealed mercy of God no less than the palpable.

We shall now give a brief sketch of our view of the whole passage. After having narrated the two mighty manifestations of divine mercy towards Israel, the victory which He gave to their arms at Gibeon, and the hail by which He punished the flying enemy, the author abruptly breaks the thread of the narrative, in order to insert a passage from a contemporary song, in which the great deeds of this day are extolled. The singer tells how Joshua said unto the Lord, "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon." It is easy to explain how Joshua may be said to have spoken to the Lord, since the address to the sun and moon immediately follows. For his desire is only apparently addressed to them; it was properly directed to the Lord of hosts. The first question which now rises is, at what time and in what place Joshua expressed this wish, or rather at what time the singer made him express it. The אָז, "at that time," cannot help us in determining this. For it is plain that it does not refer to what immediately precedes it—viz., to the flight of the enemy as far as Azekah, so that Joshua could have given utterance to the prayer when he first arrived at this place—but to the whole events of the day, the entire conquest of the enemy. This follows from the words, "In the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel," which form a closer explanation of the word *then*. We must therefore look round us for other signs. In ver. 13 we read that the sun remained standing in the midst of the heavens. It was therefore towards mid-day when Joshua expressed the wish. The determination of place, which follows from ver. 12, fully agrees with the determination of time. The words, "Sun,

stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon," are only intelligible on the supposition that they were spoken at Gibeon. There, in the thick of the fight, Joshua wishes the sun to stand still, that he may have time to conquer the enemy completely; at the time of moonlight he hopes to be at Ajalon, in pursuit of the fleeing enemy, and there the moon is not to withdraw her light until he no longer requires it. According to chap. xix. 42, Ajalon lay in what was afterwards the territory of the tribe of Dan, south-west of Gibeon, and therefore in the region towards which the fleeing kings must first turn, and where they afterwards actually went, near to Azekah: Robinson, part iii. p. 278. The singer, therefore, makes Joshua express the wish in the midst of the battle at Gibeon, that the sun and the moon might remain standing—*i.e.* that the day might not draw to a close until the defeat of the enemy should be complete. This wish was fully accomplished; and the singer narrates this in ver. 15, in such a way as to continue the image which he has begun. Joshua conquered the enemy so completely, that the day appeared to have been lengthened, and to have become a double day. Then, in ver. 14, the singer goes on to a general eulogium on the splendour of this day. When he says that no day before or after was so glorious as this, the words must be pressed in an inadmissible way in order to draw from them a proof for the miraculous lengthening of the day: comp. Ex. x. 14; 2 Kings xviii. 5, xxiii. 25. Every great salvation presents certain aspects in which it surpasses all others; comp. Deut. xxxiii. 24, where Asher is characterized as blessed among the sons of Jacob, which might with equal truth be said of the rest. According to Judg. v. 24, Jael appears as the most favoured among women, which she was, however, only from certain points of view. But the importance of this day must not be estimated too low: it was in reality one of the greatest days of Israelitish history; it may be regarded as the day of the conquest of Canaan.

The singer now concludes with the return of Joshua to Gilgal. The details concerning the pursuit of the kings, the occupation of their towns, etc., belonged to the history whose thread he now takes up again with the author of the book of Joshua.

When Joshua arrived in the vicinity of Makkedah, he received information that the five hostile kings had concealed themselves in a cave near this town, which has never been rediscovered. He himself now set up his camp at Makkedah, after having closed the mouth of the cave; the lighter troops he allowed to continue in pursuit of the enemy. These returned after they had pursued the enemy to their fortified towns. The five kings were then drawn forth from their hiding-place, and Joshua allowed his generals to tread upon their necks. This symbolical act was intended to show Israel in a palpable form the fulfilment of the promise, Deut. xxxiii. 29, and to fill them with courage for their future undertakings. In the person of the five kings, all Canaan as it were, with its apparently invincible heights and fortresses, lay under their feet. After Makkedah also had been taken, the army again moved on, and conquered several more towns, almost all in the territory of the tribe of Judah. The whole extent of the conquests made in this march is thus described by the author in ver. 41: "And Joshua smote them from Kadesh-barnea even unto Gaza, and all the country of Goshen even unto Gibeon." Gaza is here named as the western limit of the conquered territory; Gibeon as the most northern, and as the south-eastern Kadesh-barnea, in the wilderness of Pharan, more particularly in the wilderness of Zin, which are related to one another as the universal to the particular: comp. Keil on Joshua x. 41. The land of Goshen was situated in the southern part of the tribe of Judah. The enemy afterwards succeeded in re-establishing themselves in some of the conquered places. Hebron (with its Canaanitish race of giants, the Anakim, which is not really *nom. propr.*, but denotes men of giant stature), which is here named among them, according to chap. xv., must have been afterwards retaken by Caleb; Debir, according to xv. 16, 17, by Caleb's son-in-law, Othniel. This lay in the nature of the thing. There could be no complete and continuous conquest except in connection with colonization. When the complete and final expulsion of the original inhabitants from Hebron, Debir, and other places is elsewhere attributed to Joshua, Josh. xi. 21, he is only to be regarded as the general under whose auspices individuals carried out their conquests.

The victory over the kings of southern Canaan was followed by that over the northern Canaanites; like the former, the result of a great campaign. The inhabitants of the region round about the Sea of Gennesareth, and about the sources of the Jordan at the foot of Antilebanon, had not yet been stirred out of their indolent rest; they had not combined with the inhabitants of the southern districts against the Israelites, in which circumstance Calvin rightly perceives clear traces of divine providence. Not until after these nations had been conquered, when their danger had therefore become doubly great, was their attention drawn to the Israelites; and they combined in one joint undertaking. At the head of this stood Jabin, the king of Hazor, a town, according to Josh. xix. 39, situated in the later territory of the tribe of Naphtali; according to Josephus, *Ant.* v. 1, above the Samochonitic Sea. From the fact that in the time of the Judges there was also a Canaanitish king of the name of Hazor, it seems to follow that Jabin, the Wise, was not *nom. propr.*, but a hereditary title of the kings of Hazor. From Josh. xi. 10 we infer that all the other kings of that northern district stood in a certain relation of dependence to the king of Hazor—a state of things which must very easily have arisen in the constitution of the Canaanites, and which also existed afterwards among the Phœnicians. The danger of Israel was the greater, since the enemy had a large number of warlike chariots. The enemy assembled near the sea Merom—High Sea—so called as the uppermost of the seas which the waters of the Jordan flow through; in Josephus, Samochonitis—a shallow sea in which, after a short course of three hours, the various sources of the Jordan collect, swelling up at the time when the snow melts; at other times generally a swamp of rushes, now for the greater part of the year quite dry, and used as a hunting-ground. In the plains of this sea Joshua encountered the enemy, whose attack he had not expected, though he had gone out to meet them; and here he gained a glorious victory over them. Their fleeing remnant he pursued to the region of Sidon, as far as Misrephot Mayim—properly, “Burning of the waters”—a place having water with which one can burn one’s self; in all probability hot springs, not far from Sidon, as seems to follow from chap. xiii. 6. Joshua commanded the horses which were taken to be houghed,

by which the horses not merely become useless, as is generally supposed, but soon bleed to death; the chariots he burnt. The reason of this measure was not that the Israelites did not then understand how to handle horses and chariots; it had a higher aim. It symbolized what the Psalmist expresses: "Some trust in chariots, and some in horses; but we will remember the name of the Lord our God:" Ps. xx. 7. This was brought to his mind by the symbolic act. We must not, however, conclude that the Israelites acted, or were intended to act, just in the same way in all similar cases. The idea was satisfied by the one symbolic representation. This formed a permanent exhortation to Israel: "If riches increase, set not your heart upon them." The act considered as continual would bear a fanatical character, and could not be exonerated from the reproach of being a tempting of God. David had chariots and riders, and yet put his trust only in the Lord. Joshua then conquered Hazor and the other towns of the hostile kings, but only Hazor was burnt, as the head of the impotent resistance against the Lord and His people, in which, as in Jericho, the idea of the curse receives its outward representation. The author then gives a recapitulation of all the country which the Israelites conquered in this and the former campaign, chap. xi. 16, 17: "So Joshua took all that land, the hills, and all the south country, and all the land of Goshen, and the valley, and the plain, and the mountain of Israel, and the valley of the same; even from the Mount Halak, that goeth up to Seir, even unto Baal-gad, in the valley of Lebanon, under Mount Hermon." The "smooth or bald mountain," הר חלק, bordering on Idumea, is here named as the most southern part of the whole conquered district, and is not mentioned elsewhere, but is certainly situated south of the Dead Sea. The northern boundary, Baal-gad, is spoken of as lying in the valley of Lebanon, beneath Mount Hermon, and therefore in the valley which separates Lebanon and the majestic Hermon, the proper western boundary of Palestine, the main source of the Jordan. Besides these, several separate portions of the conquered land are given; especially those which had been taken in the previous campaign, because those taken on this occasion had already been mentioned. The mountain range, the southern region, the land of Goshen, and

the depression, the Arabah, together form parts of the after-tribe of Judah. The mountain range is the mountainous part which forms the centre of the country,—the low country, the district bordering on the Mediterranean Sea. The Arabah is the hollow into which the Jordan flows,—hence the most eastern part, in contradistinction from the low country, as the most western. The other places named—the mount of Israel and its depression (every place before mentioned was already conquered in the first campaign)—formed principally the after-territory of the tribe of Joseph. The mountain of this tribe had been previously designated the mountain of Israel, in contrast to the mountain of Judah, because already, long before the separation of the two kingdoms, there was a contrast between Judah and the rest of Israel, or the ten tribes, which were represented by Joseph as the most important. The time when these conquests were made is not more closely determined in the book of Joshua. It is merely stated in chap. xi. 18: “Joshua made war a long time with all those kings.” But the nearer determination may be indirectly drawn from chap. xiv., if we assume, what is highly probable, that the first division of land at Gilgal followed immediately upon the termination of this war. Immediately before it, Caleb says, in a speech to Joshua, that he is now eighty-five years of age. And since Caleb, according to chap. xiv., was sent by Moses as a spy in his fortieth year, in the beginning of the second year after the exodus out of Egypt, therefore, from thirty-eight to thirty-nine years of the life of Caleb passed away during the march through the wilderness, leaving from six to seven years for the conquest of Canaan. In the conclusion of chap. xi. we read: “So Joshua took the whole land, according to all that the Lord said unto Moses; and the land rested from war.” These words must necessarily be understood with a certain limitation. Their sense can only be this, that already, at that time, when the power of the Canaanites had been broken by the two great campaigns, the divine promise given to Moses was fulfilled in its most important sense. Some of those nations whose country had been given to the Israelites as an inheritance, had not yet been attacked by them at all. This was the case with all the Phœnicians dwelling on the sea-coast, and with all Lebanon, from Baal-gad northward, as far as Chamat in

Syria, the uttermost settlement of the Canaanitish race : comp. the narrative in chap. xiii. 1-6. Even within the conquered territory, some nationalities were either never completely subjugated, or soon recovered themselves. This is evident from several statements of this book itself, and of the book of Judges : it lies in the nature of the thing. It is impossible that a nation so numerous and powerful as the Canaanites could be completely exterminated, or driven away in two campaigns. The principal event had already been accomplished ; the power of the Canaanites in the south and north was completely broken. But there was still great scope left for the further activity of Israel, for further divine assistance. The fulfilment of the divine promise, which had previously been imperfect, served as a means for realizing the divine plan. In the country of the Israelites themselves, and in its nearest vicinity, God had prepared an instrument of punishment by which to avenge the apostasy of His people, as had been already foretold by Moses.

§ 3.

DIVISION OF THE LAND.

Concerning this, Moses had already given instructions, Num. xxvi. 52-56, comp. with chap. xxxiii. 54, which must here be more particularly explained, because at the first glance they seem to contain a contradiction. In the first passage we read : "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Unto them the land shall be divided for an inheritance, according to the number of names. To many thou shalt give the more inheritance, and to few thou shalt give the less inheritance ; to every one shall his inheritance be given according to those that were numbered of him. Notwithstanding the land shall be divided by lot," etc. The twofold determination contained in these words, that the land should be divided according to the greater or smaller number, and that it should be parcelled out by lot, appear to contradict one another. But the explanation is this : The region which each tribe was to occupy is only generally determined by lot, whether in the southern or northern part of

the land, whether on the sea or on the Jordan, etc. By this determination a multitude of otherwise unavoidable quarrels were prevented. All opposition to the result obtained by lot must appear as a murmuring against the providence of God, because, in appointing this method, He gave the most definite promise of His guidance. And when the territory was fixed in this way, it lay with those who had been commissioned to carry out the division to determine the extent and limits according to the greater or smaller number of souls in each tribe, and at the same time with reference to the fruitfulness of the country.

The tribes among which the land was to be divided were twelve in number; although Levi, in accordance with the special destiny to which it had been appointed by God, received no territory, but was commanded to dwell in separate towns which should be allotted to it, scattered throughout all Israel. For Jacob had received Joseph's two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, in the stead of children, and had placed them in exactly the same relation with his other sons, Gen. xlviii. 5. He had taken away from Reuben his right to a double portion of the inheritance, which was connected with the birthright, Deut. xxi. 17, on account of his incest, and had transferred it to Joseph on account of the great benefits which he had shown to his family in Egypt.

As already recorded, Moses directed that the land should be divided among these twelve tribes in the same way and at the same time. But circumstances occurred which hindered the complete carrying out of this regulation. First, the demand of the tribes of Reuben and Gad that the region already conquered beyond the Jordan should be allotted to them on account of their wealth in flocks, which made this district specially appropriate for them. Moses yielded to their demand, but under the condition that they should none the less cross the Jordan, and help to take Canaan proper. He also granted the demands made by a portion of the tribe of Manasseh to the most northern part of the trans-Jordanic territory, by permitting them alone to complete the conquest of it. From the analogy of the half-tribe of Manasseh we can reason respecting the two other tribes. If Manasseh's territory, the former kingdom of Og of Bashan, were assigned to him because he had conquered it, the same would hold good with reference

to Reuben and Gad. They certainly do not expressly mention the claim which they had gained to the country by their deeds of arms; but this is only modesty. They say, "The country which the Lord smote before the congregation of Israel," withdrawing behind Jehovah and Israel, in whose service and stead they had acted; but the claim stands in the background. The mere number of their flocks, which they doubtless gained in conquering the land of Sihon, would not have been a sufficient motive; the demand would have been presumptuous, and would not have been regarded by Moses if it had not had such a foundation. The country beyond the Jordan was therefore assigned to these two and a half tribes without lot; the first among the three general divisions which occurred. Let us learn somewhat more accurately the district and seat which the tribes received. The western boundary of it is the Jordan, the eastern the Arabian desert, the southern the brook Arnon, the northern Mount Hermon. This whole district bears in Scripture in a wide sense the name of Gilead. According to other passages, when Gilead is taken in a stricter sense it is divided into the two districts Gilead and Bashan. The tribe of Reuben receives the most southern part of this whole district, separated on the south from the Moabites by the brook Arnon. Its northern boundary began somewhere above the Dead Sea. This region had been completely in possession of the Amorites, was then taken from them by the Moabites, and was finally retaken by them. On its borders, parallel to the north end of the Dead Sea, lay its old royal city Hesbon, now Hesbân. Reuben was followed by Gad, separated by Jabbok on the east from the country of the Amorites, whom the Israelites might not drive out from their possessions because they were blood-relations. The half-tribe Manasseh received the most northern part of the country beyond the Jordan, the most northern part of Gilead in a strict sense, and all Bashan. Of this portion of territory North Gilead fell to the race of Machir, by whom it had been taken. Bashan was assigned to Jair, a valiant hero.

According to this division, made by the authority of Moses, there were therefore only nine and a half tribes to provide for. The main camp was still at Gilgal. There, at the time already named, after the close of the campaign narrated, Joshua deter-

mined to undertake the division of the land. The reason which called forth this determination just at the present time was probably the conviction, that permanent possession of the country in all its various parts could only be obtained in connection with colonization. Yet this determination was very imperfectly fulfilled at that time. Only the tribes of Judah, Ephraim, and half-Manasseh received their territory. The cause of the incomplete accomplishment is not expressly given in the narrative. Yet it may be gathered with some probability from several hints, although considerable obscurity remains, and the matter requires far more thorough and profound discussion than it has recently received from Keil. In the division Joshua acted on the fundamental axiom, that all the land not yet conquered should be considered as conquered, and must also be parcelled out by lot, ch. xiii. 6. In this spirit he regulated the size of the first-drawn lot of the tribe of Judah and of the tribe of Ephraim. So great an extent was given to these tribes, that the greater part of the country which was already conquered fell to them alone. But the remaining tribes were not satisfied with this. Their confidence in the divine promise was not so great that, like Joshua, the hero of faith, they could be as sure of the land that had still to be conquered as of that already conquered. They would prefer still to continue their unsettled life for a period rather than acknowledge the division. They wished to see first how it would go with the further occupation of the land, in order, in case it should prove unfavourable, to lay claim to a portion of the territory of the tribes of Judah and Joseph. That this was the case appears from the fact that, in the later third division at Shiloh, the promised land was not parcelled out, but only the conquered land, and that the tribes of Judah and Ephraim were obliged to give up part of their territory. The tribe of Benjamin was inserted between the two; the tribe of Dan received its possessions westwards, between the two; then Judah was obliged to cede a portion of Simeon. Let us now speak particularly of the distribution at Gilgal. Before the drawing of lots had commenced, according to Josh. xiv. 6 ff., Caleb, called the Kenezite—*i.e.* the descendant of a certain Kenaz, of whom nothing further is known—came before Joshua, accompanied by the representatives of the tribe

of Judah, which, in order to give more weight to the private petition of one of its citizens, treated it as a general one, and demanded the region round about Hebron, as promised to him, in reward for his faithfulness to the Lord amid the unfaithfulness of the other spies who were sent out with him. The event may be found narrated in Num. xiii. and Deut. i. In the latter passage, in ver. 36, mention is made of a promise given by Moses to Caleb, yet without an exact definition of the portion of land to be given to Caleb, which is also wanting in Num. xiv. 24. It is only stated, that the Lord would give him and his sons the land which he had trodden. That this has reference to Hebron and its environs, where, according to Num. xiv. 24, the spies remained for a long time, we first learn with full certainty from the narrative in the book of Joshua. Caleb's intention in now demanding the fulfilment of this obligation was probably to separate his fate from that of his tribe, which was to be settled by lot. Joshua does nothing further than to give him Hebron; and, according to ch. xv. 1, the tribe of Judah received its territory by lot. It was a decree of divine providence that the lot should have fallen so that Caleb received his inheritance in his tribe. Moreover, it follows from ch. xx. 7, comp. with ch. xxi. 4, that the town of Hebron was afterwards ceded by Caleb to the Levites, as part of their possession, in consequence of its choice as a free city for unintentional murder,—for such cities were always obliged to be Levitical. Caleb could accede to this the more readily, since he retained what was most important for him, viz. the surrounding district.

In all probability the drawing of lots was so ordered that in one of the vessels were placed the names of the twelve tribes, in the other the designations of the twelve portions of land. As soon as the lot of one tribe was drawn, before proceeding further, the limits of this tribe were determined in proportion to the number of its members. Some—for example, Masius and Bachiëne—have thought that Joshua's previous intention at Gilgal was only to allow the two tribes, Judah and Joseph, to draw lots between themselves, and to defer the distribution of the land among the other tribes until the remaining territory should be conquered. But this view is at variance with the narrative in the book of Joshua. According to chap. xiv. 1 ff.

Joshua and the high priest had no other idea than to allow all the tribes to draw lots. The drawing of lots can therefore only have been interrupted by the circumstances already mentioned. If this were not so, we cannot see why at least a few of the tribes besides Judah and Ephraim should not also have drawn lots, since in any case there would have been space enough for them in the land already conquered, even if Judah and Joseph had retained the whole of their territory; as is sufficiently shown by the subsequent division at Shiloh, between which and that at Gilgal no important conquests were made.

The first lot fell to the tribe of Judah. As the most numerous tribe, he received the largest territory, the district south of Gilgal in its whole extent between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean.

The next lot fell to the children of Joseph. Several, as for example Calvin, think that Ephraim and Manasseh had each a separate lot. The fact that the lots are in close succession, and that both districts immediately adjoined one another, they attribute to a special working of divine providence. But this already gives more probability to the other view, which supposes that there was only a common lot for Ephraim and Manasseh, and that they afterwards divided the land which they had received in this way by lot between themselves. This view is confirmed by the narrative, chap. xvi. 1 ff., where mention is made only of a common lot of the children of Ephraim. In this way it came about that the brethren received their inheritance together. Of this common inheritance the tribe of Ephraim received the southern portion. The brook Cana formed the boundary between the two. Ephraim occupied the whole breadth of the land. For both sea and Jordan come into the settlement of the boundary. Between it and Judah lay the tribes of Dan and Benjamin, according to the later determination at Shiloh, which lies at the basis of the statement of the boundaries.

The third division among the seven tribes which still remained occurred at Shiloh, a place whose ruins even now bear the name Seilûn: comp. Robinson, iii. p. 303 ff. Thither the tabernacle of the covenant was transferred from Gilgal. Joshua chose Shiloh, probably because it lay in the tribe of Ephraim, to which he himself belonged, in order to have the tabernacle of

the covenant in the neighbourhood. Add to this that Shiloh was almost in the middle of Canaan, and was therefore easily accessible to all the tribes. There the sanctuary remained for some centuries, during the whole time of the Judges, until, towards the end of this period, it was transferred to Nob, owing to a cause which will be narrated hereafter.

Joshua had by this time perceived that the indolence and want of faith of the Israelites would render the accomplishment of the earlier plan, viz. the whole distribution of the promised land, impossible. Since the distribution at Shiloh nothing of any consequence had been done towards the conquest of the land that still remained. He must therefore content himself with the distribution of the country already conquered, at least in the mass, in order not to leave undone the commission given him by the Lord to distribute the land. The division was now carried out with the greatest precision and foresight. By Joshua's command Judah and Joseph were to retain their inheritance in those districts which had formerly been allotted to them. One-and-twenty men from the tribes which still remained, three out of every tribe, were to traverse the country, take a geographical survey of it, and divide it into seven parts. In this the Israelites were doubtless assisted by the Egyptian school. Ancient authors, especially Herodotus, ii. 109, Strabo, xvii. 787, Diod. Sic. i. 69, agree in maintaining that Egypt was the fatherland of geographical survey and measurement. The condition of the country must necessarily have led to this invention at a very early period; for, by the overflow of the Nile, boundaries were annually made unrecognisable. We can scarcely suppose but that the persons who were sent out by Joshua made plans or charts of the land, although this is not expressly stated: comp. Clericus on chap. xvii. 2. But there was probably no geometrical measurement of the land in detail: comp. Keil on the other side. After the land had been surveyed in this way, the districts were assigned to the seven tribes by lot. The first lot fell upon the tribe of Benjamin. Its northern limit was the southern boundary of the tribe of Ephraim, already mentioned; its southern limit the northern boundary of Judah; on the east it bordered on the Jordan; and on the west, about the centre of the country, on the tribe of Dan, by which it was shut out from the Mediterranean Sea.

After Benjamin's lot came that of Simeon. Of him we read in Josh. xix. 1: "And their inheritance was within the inheritance of the children of Judah." This is generally understood to mean that Simeon had a district with definite boundaries, but enclosed round about by the tribe of Judah. But such is not probable, for the reason that, in this case, the boundaries of Simeon are not given, as in all the other tribes, but only an enumeration of the towns in his possession. And these towns are too far distant from one another to give any probability to the hypothesis of a common territory. Moreover, on this supposition, it would be impossible to explain the statement of the dying Jacob in Gen. xlix. 7, that the descendants of Simeon should be no less scattered than those of Levi, on account of the crime perpetrated by the two ancestors together. According to this, therefore, it is far more probable that Simeon only received mere unconnected towns in Judah, with their environs, which also explains why he is omitted in the blessing of Moses. The blessing of Judah concerned him also. The third place was taken by Zebulun. It seems that this tribe must have touched the sea; for, otherwise, neither would the blessing of Jacob have been fulfilled—where special prominence is given to the fact that Zebulun would enjoy the privilege of living on the sea-coast—nor the blessing of Moses, where the sea is also assigned to him as a limit. But the bordering on the sea seems to be entirely excluded by the passage Josh. xvii. 10, comp. with xix. 26, where we read that the tribe of Manasseh bordered northwards on Asher, and that Asher stretched as far as the promontory Carmel, on the Mediterranean Sea. The explanation is this: In the blessing of Jacob and Moses no special mention is made of the tribe of Zebulun as such; but only in connection with the name Zebulun, dwelling, prominence is given to the advantages which Israel generally enjoyed by their dwelling on the sea, since most of the blessings are not individual, but are only applications of the universal blessing. It is only false interpretation which would draw from Josh. xix. 11 that Zebulun bordered on the sea. לִימָה does not there mean *usque ad mare*, but westwards.

The tribe of Issachar received the fourth lot. Its northern boundary was the tribe of Zebulun; its eastern boundary, the lowest part of the Sea of Tiberias, and the Jordan; its southern

boundary, the tribe of Ephraim; its western boundary, the tribe of Manasseh, by which it was cut off from the Mediterranean Sea. To it belonged the eastern part of the extremely fruitful plain of Israel, now Esdraelon. The fifth lot fell upon the children of the tribe of Asher. It was a narrow, but very long stretch of land, extending from Carmel northwards to Lebanon and Hermon; yet the most northern districts probably never came completely into possession of the tribe. Its western limit was partly the Mediterranean Sea, partly Phœnicia; its eastern limit was reckoned from north to south. The colony of the Danites in the spring-land of the Jordan, the tribes of Naphtali, Zebulun, and Issachar. Its southern boundary the tribe of Manasseh. The sixth lot fell to the children of Naphtali. It bordered, we read in Josh. xix. 34, on the south on Zebulun, on the west on Asher, and on the east on Judah at the Jordan. These latter words have given great difficulty to expositors. The correct explanation has been established by Raumer, in his *Palestine*, 4th edit. p. 233, and in his contributions to *Biblical Geography*. Judah on the Jordan is the district of Bashan, the inheritance of Jair, who was descended on his father's side from Judah, on his mother's side from Manasseh, comp. the genealogy in 1 Chron. ii. 21-23, to which latter tribe he is generally reckoned, because he was a bastard son. The seat of the last tribe, Dan (already sufficiently denoted), was between Judah, Ephraim, the Mediterranean Sea, and Benjamin. He had a territory difficult to conquer, and still more difficult to maintain. Afterwards the Danites, oppressed by the Amorites, who had re-established themselves in their former territory and robbed them of the best part of their land, undertook a march into the most northern part of Palestine, the cradle-land of the Jordan, above the tribe of Naphtali, and there founded a colony whose capital, Leshem or Laish, which they had conquered, received through them the name of Dan.

After the division had been completed, progress was made towards the execution of the Mosaic decree respecting the establishment of free cities. Moses found the habit of blood-revenge common among his people, or the custom that the relatives of a murdered man must kill the murderer, under penalty of indelible shame; a custom so firmly rooted among the

race allied to the Hebrews—the Arabians—that it could not be eradicated by the means which Mohammed instituted against it in the Koran. The injurious consequences of this custom need scarcely be pointed out. The punishment often fell upon those who were quite innocent, because the avenger of blood allowed himself to be deceived by a false report. It involved the rash manslayer no less than the intentional murderer. One murder gave rise to an endless succession of others, especially since a private affair was frequently taken up by the tribe, as the history of the Arabs shows. The *nimbus* in which the blood-revenge was clothed must on the whole have had a strong tendency to promote coarseness and cruelty; as we have melancholy proof in the writings of the Arabs before Mohammed. But this very *nimbus* made it extremely difficult to root out the custom, as we may perceive from the analogy of duels. The manner in which Moses sought to eradicate the injurious custom justified itself by the result. He ordained that the Israelites, after the occupation of the land, should establish free cities of refuge from the avengers of blood, Num. xxxv.; Deut. xix. The roads to these cities, which were situated in all parts of the land, were to be kept carefully in repair. In order to give the places a special sanctity, they were all to be Levitical towns. If the perpetrator fortunately arrived in one of these cities, investigation was first of all made whether he was a murderer or a manslayer. If the former, he was given up by justice to the avenger of blood—in which respect the law gave way to established custom. By the enactment that the murderer was to be dragged away, even from the altar, and was to die, Ex. xxi. 14, the asylums of the Israelites were essentially distinguished from those of the Greeks and Romans, and also of the middle ages, which afforded protection to criminals of every kind. If the perpetrator were found innocent, the free city was a sure place of refuge for him. He dared not, however, venture beyond the limits of it. If the avenger of blood were to meet him outside the city, he might kill him; in which circumstance there was also a concession to the prevailing custom. Not until after the death of the then high priest, which, as a country-wide calamity, had a softening and conciliating effect upon the minds of all, durst the murderer return to his native town with perfect safety.

In vain do Baumgarten and Keil attribute atoning significance to the death of the high priest. This banishment served a double end. It spared the pain of the relatives of the murdered man, which, aroused by the constant sight of the murderer, might easily have driven them to the perpetration of revenge; and at the same time testimony was borne to the value of man's blood in the sight of God, who thus punished even an unintentional shedding of it. Compare the copious exposition in Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, ii. § 131 ff.

The time had now come when the Levites were also to receive the maintenance destined for them. It was enjoined by law, Num. xxxv., that every tribe, in proportion to its size, should cede certain cities, with their immediate environs—as much as would suffice to pasture their cattle. The number of these cities amounted in all to forty-eight. At first sight this provision appears too large for a tribe so comparatively small in numbers. But this semblance disappears when we consider that the cities were inhabited not by the Levites alone, but also by their artisans, etc., from other tribes, who in some cases constituted the greater part of the population: comp. Lev. xxv. 33; 1 Chron. vi. 40, 41. The distribution of these cities among the Levites was accomplished in the following manner: The tribe of Levi was divided into four minor sections. Levi had three sons: Gershom, Kohath, and Merari. The race of the Kohathites was again divided into a double section, the priestly and the non-priestly. Thus Aaron was Kohath's descendant through Amram, and in his posterity, by the Mosaic decree, the hereditary priesthood was exclusively bound up. Of the four sons of Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar, the two former died in his lifetime, leaving no children. Eleazar and Ithamar therefore became the ancestors of the whole priestly race. These, so far as we can judge, were, even in the Mosaic time, surrounded by a considerable number of sons and grandsons; and it is only by a misunderstanding of Num. iii. 4 that Colenso assumes that there were at that time only three priests. He takes Eleazar and Ithamar to be merely individuals, whereas they ought rather to be considered as heads of races. Aaron died in the last year of the march through the wilderness, at an age of 123 years, so that the priestly race at his death might already have branched out

far and wide. After these four divisions, the forty-eight cities were divided into four lots. By a special decree of divine providence it happened that the priestly race received the cities in Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin, and therefore in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, afterwards the seat of the sanctuary. The discrepancies between the list of the Levitical towns in the book of Joshua and that in 1 Chron. vii. are most easily explained by the fact that a few of the towns assigned to the Levites were at that time still in possession of the Canaanites, and because the hope of immediate conquest proved deceitful, were provisionally replaced by others, which were afterwards retained to escape the inconvenience of changing.

§ 4.

RETURN OF THE TRANS-JORDANIC TRIBES.—JOSHUA'S LAST EXHORTATIONS.—ACCOUNTS GIVEN IN OTHER PLACES OF THE HISTORY OF JOSHUA.—CONDITION OF THE ISRAELITES UNDER HIM.

After the distribution of the land, the two and a half tribes were dismissed to their territory by Joshua. The departure took place at Shiloh. A decree which met them upon their way back had almost given rise to a bloody civil war; the event is of importance so far as it shows us how the strict judgments of God in the wilderness, and His manifestations of grace on the taking of the land, did not fall short of their aim, since they had inspired even the mass of the people with the desire to be well-pleasing to the Lord, and with holy awe of incurring His displeasure by neglect of His commands. When the tribes had come to the Jordan, therefore to the eastern boundary of the land of Canaan in the stricter sense, they there built an altar, on the shore on this side, not on the opposite side, as some have supposed, contrary to the clear, literal sense, and with total misapprehension of the meaning of the act. Their intention was that this altar, an image of the altar in the tabernacle of the covenant, should bear witness to posterity that its builders had *communia sacra* with those in

whose land it was built, had part and inheritance in the Lord. The trans-Jordanic country was never expressly mentioned in the promises to the patriarchs, which is remarkable, and shows that they were not made only *post eventum*. They feared that because the land on their side of the Jordan was the true land of promise, the seat of the sanctuary of the Lord, the descendants of the tribes on this side might, at a future time, contest with them the participation in the prerogatives of the covenant-nation, and exclude them from the sanctuary of the Lord. In accordance with the spirit of antiquity, as it speaks most characteristically in the words of Joshua to the nation on another opportunity, chap. xxiv. 27, "Behold this stone shall be a witness unto us; for it hath heard all the words of the Lord which He spake unto us," they believed that they could meet this danger in no better way; and the very fact that they sought so carefully to meet it shows that faith had struck its roots into them. They did not transgress the command of Moses to build no other altar besides that in the tabernacle of the covenant. What they erected bore the name of an altar only in a figurative sense. They had no intention of sacrificing there, in opposition to Deut. xii. 13, "Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt-offerings in every place that thou seest." Their altar was nothing more than an image and memorial. They were to blame only in not telling their plan and design previously to Joshua and the high priest Eleazar, and obtaining their approval.

The news of their undertaking caused great disturbance among the tribes on this side, who were ignorant of its object. It did not indeed occur to them that the altar was dedicated to another god than the God of Israel; so flagrant an apostasy could not have been imagined at that time. But the opinion was that they wished to honour the true God by sacrifice in a self-chosen place, and even this appeared as the beginning of a greater and complete apostasy, to guard against which had been the very object of the law relative to the unity of the sanctuary. The *ἐθελοθρησκεία* with regard to places leads to the *ἐθελοθρησκεία* with regard to objects of worship. This is the deepest reason of the Mosaic regulation. Worship must be withdrawn from the province of caprice, from the invention of the nation. Just as they were to worship God not after

their own subjective ideas, but as He had revealed Himself, so also they were to worship Him where He had revealed Himself, where He had promised to be. The people flocked together to Shiloh, determined to prevent the intended evil. But before going any further, Phinehas, the son of Eleazar the high priest, who had formerly distinguished himself by his zeal for the Lord, comp. Num. xxv., was sent in company with the ten princes of the tribes to the two and a half tribes, in harmony with the regulation in Deut. xiii. 15, according to which the truth of the report of such evil was first to be examined into, before proceeding to punishment. His address to them is earnest and severe. The answer of the two and a half tribes removes the misunderstanding, restores peace, and awakens great joy.

With the distribution of the land Joshua had fulfilled his vocation. He now retired to his town Timnath-Serach upon Mount Ephraim, chap. xix. 50, and there spent the last years of his pilgrimage in quiet retirement. When he perceived that his end was approaching he sent for the people—*i.e.*, as appears from the limiting definition in chap. xxiii. 2 and xxiv. 1, the representatives and officers of the nation, perhaps also those who had repaired voluntarily to the prescribed place of assembling—and there addressed them in the affecting speeches related in chaps. xxiii. and xxiv. Some—for example, Calvin and Maurer—have assumed that both chapters contain one and the same address of Joshua, uttered at Sichem—the former by extract, the latter in detail. But Masius, on chap. xxiii., has already pointed out the contrary very clearly. The new mention of the assembly of the whole people, and of the place where it was convened, in chap. xxiv., is totally inexplicable on the other hypothesis. The place where the first discourse was held—in which Joshua begins by reminding the nation of all the mercies of the Lord, and then represents to them the blessings which they have to expect if they are faithful, and the punishments if they are unfaithful—is not defined. And just because this is not done, we must conclude that the assembly was held at Shiloh, beside the holy tent, which from Josh. xviii. 1 to the death of Joshua appears throughout as the centre of the nation.

The second, and far more solemn assembly, was called at Sichem. The reason why a second assembly was convened lies in the character of the place. It gave the people an excitement which had been wanting in Shiloh. The LXX. regarded it as so strange that Shiloh should not rather have served for the place of assembling, that they substituted Shiloh for Sichem. Some think they can explain it from the sole circumstance that Sichem was the place where the rulers of the people were assembled in order to bury the bones of Joseph, comp. xxiv. 32. It is at least possible that this happened at that time, although it might equally well have happened before (which is even more probable), since in the passage referred to it is only told by way of supplement. But in no case is this supposition necessary to explain the choice of Sichem. We have already seen that it was a place especially hallowed by memorials of the patriarchs. There the patriarch Jacob had undertaken a similar consecration of his house, comp. Josh. xxiv. 23, 26 with Gen. xxxv. 2-4. Shiloh had nothing of the kind to show; already the name of the town, from שֵׁלָה, to be at rest, and the way in which, in the book of Joshua, it is combined with the observation that the whole land rested from war, chap. xviii. 1, appears to indicate that the town was first founded by the Israelites, and increased rapidly; because, by means of the national sanctuary, it had become the national centre. Sichem had received new meaning through Joshua himself, who there solemnly renewed the covenant with the Lord, immediately after the first entering the land; and perpetuated this renewal by a memorial. Owing to this very circumstance, it must have appeared to Joshua specially fitted for his present design, because it was his intention, before his end, to constrain the people once more to keep the covenant. From the circumstance that in ver. 1 it is said that the Israelites appeared before the Lord at Sichem, many have supposed that Joshua had either the ark of the covenant alone, or else the whole sacred tabernacle brought to Sichem. לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, certainly, is not unfrequently used of the ark of the covenant, and there is no lack of examples of its having been brought from its usual place to another on special occasions. But it follows from chap. xxiv. 26 that this was not the case here; at least we are not at liberty to assume that the words "before God,"

לפני האלהים, have reference to it. Here we read: "And Joshua took a great stone, and set it up there under *the* oak (not, as some maintain, *an* oak) that was by the sanctuary of the Lord." By the "sanctuary of the Lord" it is impossible here to understand the ark of the covenant, or the tent, because we read that the oak stands in it. But even if we were to grant that the *במקדש* might here mean "in the neighbourhood of the sanctuary," although the *ב* can never exactly mean "near to," it would yet be quite unsuitable to say that the oak was beside the ark of the covenant, since the latter would rather have been beside the former. The ark would only have been here temporarily, while the oak remained permanently. Evidently it is the author's object to give an exact definition of the place where the memorial was. But how could the ark of the covenant or the tent serve as such, when it might perhaps be carried away again on the following day? Without doubt the correct view is the following: The oak is that tree under which Abraham had his first vision of the Lord, after his immigration into Canaan, and near which he had built an altar: comp. Gen. xii. 6, 7. Under the same oak Jacob had afterwards buried the idols which his wives had brought with them from Mesopotamia, ch. xxxv. 4. The environs of this oak were sacred by the events which had occurred there. They were therefore called *מקדש*, sanctuary; just as Jacob called the place where he had a vision *בית אל*, "the house of God." Great was the number of sanctuaries in this sense in Canaan, because great had been the revelations of the Lord in the past. Their recognition was not at variance with the law respecting the unity of the sanctuary. For this had reference only to the sanctuary as a place of sacrifice. Here, therefore, where the nearness of God was especially palpable, Joshua summoned the nation before God. And here he begins by recounting to the Israelites the whole series of the benefits of God, beginning with the call of Abraham. The only difficulty we have is that in ver. 12 it is said that the Lord sent hornets before the Israelites, which destroyed the Canaanites out of their land. We find no mention of this in the book of Joshua. Nevertheless many expositors have thought it necessary to assume that a number of the Canaanites were really driven away by hornets. The Catholics were the less able to do otherwise,

since in the Book of Wisdom, chap. xii. 8, the plague of hornets seems to be narrated as a historical occurrence. Some try to meet the objection drawn from the silence of the book of Joshua by supposing that reference is here made to an event prior to the occupation of the Israelites—a view whose untenableness, however, may readily be shown. In order to prove the possibility of the thing, those passages have carefully been collated which tell of great damages caused by flies, wasps, etc.: comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii. 4, 13. But neither here nor in the promises, Ex. xxiii. 28, Deut. vii. 20, to which Joshua alludes, and which he characterizes as fulfilled, is there any argument in favour of the view that the sending of hornets by the Lord is to be understood literally; which would only be the case if the history told of a literal fulfilment. With equal justice we might also maintain that ch. xxiii. 13 is to be understood literally, where we read that the Canaanites were made “snares and traps” to the rebellious Israelites, scourges in their side and thorns in the eyes. We find similar images elsewhere: comp. Deut. i. 44; Isa. vii. 18. The hornets are an image of the divine terror, by which the minds of the Canaanites were first made soft and cowardly, so that they lost the power of resistance, as appears from Ex. xxiii. 28, comp. with ver. 27. Augustine already takes this view, *August. Quæst. 27 in Josh.*: “Acerrimos timoris stimulos quibus quodammodo volantibus rumoribus pungebantur ut fugerent.” Joshua then puts to the nation the solemn question, whether they will continue to serve the Lord. And when this is answered in the affirmative, and reiterated in the affirmative, after he has placed before the nation all the greatness of the promise, he solemnly renews the covenant of the Lord with them. On this renewal a document was written and appended to the law of Moses, to the Pentateuch, which lay by the side of the ark of the covenant. Later, when the book of Joshua had been composed, and the original documents had been incorporated in this, it ceased to be appended to the Pentateuch. Some, indeed, try to understand ver. 26, where this particular is recorded, as referring to the whole book of Joshua; but the entire context speaks so clearly against this view, that its origin can only be attributed to the effort to make the book itself bear testimony to its having been composed by Joshua. Not long afterwards Joshua

died at the age of 110 years (about the year of the world 2570).

In ancient times much trouble was taken to find in heathen authors confirmations of the history of Joshua. In this respect those were most in error who made him the Hercules of the Greeks, a *jeu d'esprit* which now scarcely deserves mention. But, with special interest, in the same spirit in which people now in England inquire concerning the ten tribes of Israel, investigations were made concerning the region to which the Canaanites who fled before Israel repaired. There is scarcely any country of the earth in which some one has not placed the escaped Canaanites, drawing a strong proof for his assumption from the names of countries, places, and nations. It would be loss of time for us to subject these productions of a vain imagination to profound examination. Even the opinion, which has comparatively the best foundation, that the Canaanites fled to Africa, and especially to Numidia, of which theory the main support is a passage from the late and uncertain Procopius (*Vand.* ii. 20), does not deserve a thorough examination. We refer to the discussion of Anton v. Dale, at the end of the work *de origine et progressu idololatrias*, Amstld. 1696, p. 749 *sqq.*, after reading which it will appear incomprehensible how Bertheau can still maintain that scarcely any objection can be made to its authenticity; or how Lengerke can speak of the well-known authentic inscription. At all events it is certain that the Canaanites were not all destroyed by the sword of the Israelites. Yet there is nothing inconsistent with the supposition that those who did not perish, nor, like the Jebusites, maintain themselves for a long period in the land taken by the Israelites, in that part of the country which had not been reached by the conquests of the Israelites, may have found refuge in Phœnicia and in the district of Lebanon and Antilebanon. It is also possible that a portion of these fugitive Canaanites may have helped to form Phœnician colonies. But it is improbable that great hosts of them emigrated and peopled whole countries, which is certainly not warranted by any consideration.

We shall now make a few observations on the history of religion in Joshua's time. That in this period there was no further advance of the Old Testament principle, such as took


place afterwards by the prophets, may be inferred from the character of it, as portrayed in the previous historical sketch ; so that we must regard it *a priori* as a totally useless undertaking when Ewald here tries to insert a whole series of religious institutions, which he has torn away from their natural soil, that of the Mosaic time. *Inter arma silent leges*. The main theme of the age was rather an external one—that of putting Israel in possession of the promised land, and so securing the condition of future development. The most fitting emblem for this period is the Angel of God with the drawn sword, which meets us just on its threshold. Joshua himself, the representative of Israel at this time, is throughout a warlike figure. Already the Pentateuch places him in remarkable contrast with Moses. But at the same time this period was entrusted with the task of exercising the nation in obedience to the law given by Moses, of teaching them to learn this law by heart. And the latter aim, as we have already fully seen, was attained in a high degree. In *Judg. ii. 7* we read: "And the people served the Lord all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that outlived Joshua, who had seen all the great works of the Lord that He did for Israel." Yet this applies, as is self-evident, only to the mass of the people ; it would clash with all experience and with the scriptural idea of human nature if we were to assume that every individual among the Israelites was free from idolatry. Idolatry was, as unbelief is now, the form in which at that time the mind of the natural man appeared. We can never separate it from this its basis, and regard it as something accidental, as an incomprehensible absurdity. Among the mass of the Israelites this natural tendency was suppressed and hindered from breaking out, if not completely destroyed, partly through love to the true God, whose magnanimous acts they had just experienced, partly through fear of Him and of the strict control of His servant Joshua. How distinctly Joshua stands out in the foreground at this time, and how little it helps the current interchange of theocracy and hierarchy, appears from the remark of Paulus: "This high priest (Eleazar) must have led Joshua with great delicacy, since his name appears so little in the history, while Joshua seems to do everything." Nevertheless we cannot but suppose that individuals transgressed this barrier, and if

not openly, yet in secret, practised idolatry—or at least did homage to subordinate gods besides the true God. For it is very difficult to conceive the complete non-existence of the heathen deities, those giant images, which had the *consensus gentium* against it. But we can prove by definite testimony that it was so. Joshua says in his farewell speech, chap. xxiv. 14: “And put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the flood, and in Egypt;” and ver. 23: “Now, therefore, put away the strange gods which are among you.” It is true that Augustine in the *Quaest. 29 in Josuam*, Calvin, and recently Keil, have supposed that reference was here made, not to external idolatry, but to idolatrous fancies and thoughts. But if these cannot be excluded in any way, the words clearly imply the putting away of literal idols. And, moreover, it is impossible to conceive of idolatrous thoughts without an effort after their realization in idolatrous worship. That the fear of God had not become absolutely universal also appears from chap. xxii. 17, where the messengers of the ten tribes say to the two and a half tribes to which they are sent: “Is the iniquity of Peor too little for us, from which we are not cleansed until this day?” Some understand these words in a sense according to which they would not belong here. Thus Calvin thinks that “from which we are not cleansed until this day” is equivalent to “which we still have fresh in our memories;” Michaelis: “which even now tends to our reproach and shame.” But already Masius has shown that this meaning does not satisfy the text. The being cleansed from a fault means the granting of forgiveness for it, according to the prevailing usage of Scripture, which cannot be abandoned even here. It had, indeed, already been granted, after the heroic act of Phinehas, with regard to the whole nation, in so far that a stop was put to the destructive punishment, comp. Num. xxv. 2. But the absolute bestowment of forgiveness was not yet implied in the cessation of the punishment. This was attached to a condition, the repentance of the individuals involved in the guilt; and, since the whole nation had more or less participated in it, to the repentance of the whole nation. Phinehas here explains that the unconditional bestowment of forgiveness had not yet come to pass; and hence we are justified in concluding that, even at that time, a considerable portion of the nation continued in a

perverse mind ; for if they had truly turned away from the sin, they would also have been freed from the divine anger which rested upon them. Concerning the external form of religion in this period there is little to be said. The sole remarkable change which took place in that respect, viz. the transfer of the sanctuary to Shiloh, has already been commented on.

The impression made on the after-world by the events of Joshua's time, the incitement thus afforded to the love of God, and their significance for the religious development of the nation, we and others learn from the beginning of the 44th Psalm : "We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what work Thou didst in their days, in the times of old. How Thou didst drive out the heathen with Thy hand, and plantedst them ; how Thou didst afflict the people, and cast them out. For they got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them : but Thy right hand, and Thine arm, and the light of Thy countenance, because Thou hadst a favour unto them."

THE END.



T. and T. Clark's Publications.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library.

A COLLECTION OF ALL THE WORKS OF THE FATHERS OF THE
CHRISTIAN CHURCH, PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA,

EDITED BY THE

REV. ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D.D.,

Author of 'Discussions on the Gospels,' etc.,

AND

JAMES DONALDSON, LL.D.,

Rector of the Royal High School, Edinburgh, and Author of
'Early Christian Literature and Doctrine.'

MESSRS. CLARK are now happy to announce the near completion of this Series. It has been received with marked approval by all sections of the Christian Church in this country and in the United States, as supplying what has long been felt to be a want, and also on account of the impartiality, learning, and care with which Editors and Translators have executed a very difficult task.

The whole Series will be completed in Twenty-four Volumes, of which Twenty-two are ready, and the remaining Two will be published as early as possible.

Each Work is supplied with a good and full Index; but, to add to the value of the completed Series, an Index Volume is preparing for the whole Series, which will be sold separately to those who may desire it, at a moderate price; and the complete Series (exclusive of General Index), in Twenty-four Volumes, will cost Six Guineas.

The Subscription for 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, and 6th Years is now due—£6, 6s. *The Subscription to the Series is at the rate of 21s. for Four Volumes when paid in advance (or 24s. when not so paid), and 10s. 6d. each Volume to Non-Subscribers.*

The Publishers, however, do not bind themselves to *continue* to supply the complete Series at this rate.

Single Years cannot be had separately, with the exception of current year, unless to complete sets, but *any Volume* may be had separately, price 10s. 6d.

The Homilies of Origen are not included in the Series, as the Publishers have received no encouragement to have them translated.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

ANTE-NICENE CHRISTIAN LIBRARY—*continued.*

The Works are arranged as follow:—

FIRST YEAR.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS, comprising Clement's Epistles to the Corinthians; Polycarp to the Ephesians; Martyrdom of Polycarp; Epistle of Barnabas; Epistles of Ignatius (longer and shorter, and also the Syriac version); Martyrdom of Ignatius; Epistle to Diognetus; Pastor of Hermas; Papias; Spurious Epistles of Ignatius. In One Volume.

JUSTIN MARTYR; ATHENAGORAS. In One Volume.

TATIAN; THEOPHILUS; THE CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS. In One Volume.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, Volume First, comprising Exhortation to Heathen; The Instructor; and a portion of the Miscellanies.

SECOND YEAR.

HIPPOLYTUS, Volume First; Refutation of all Heresies and Fragments from his Commentaries.

IRENÆUS, Volume First.

TERTULLIAN AGAINST MARCION.

CYPRIAN, Volume First; the Epistles and some of the Treatises.

THIRD YEAR.

IRENÆUS (completion); HIPPOLYTUS (completion); Fragments of Third Century. In One Volume.

ORIGEN: De Principiis; Letters; and portion of Treatise against Celsus.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, Volume Second; Completion of Miscellanies.

TERTULLIAN, Volume First: To the Martyrs; Apology; To the Nations, etc.

FOURTH YEAR.

CYPRIAN, Volume Second (completion); Novatian; Minucius Felix; Fragments.

METHODIUS; ALEXANDER OF LYCOPOLIS; PETER OF ALEXANDRIA; Anatolius; Clement on Virginity, and Fragments.

TERTULLIAN, Volume Second.

APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS; ACTS AND REVELATIONS, comprising all the very curious Apocryphal Writings of the first Three Centuries.

FIFTH YEAR.

TERTULLIAN, Volume Third (completion).

CLEMENTINE HOMILIES; APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS. In One Volume.
ARNOBIUS.

DIONYSIUS; GREGORY THAUMATURGUS; SYRIAN FRAGMENTS. In One Volume.

SIXTH YEAR.

LACTANTIUS. Two Volumes.

ORIGEN, Volume Second (completion).

EARLY LITURGIES AND REMAINING FRAGMENTS.

} *Shortly.*



BS1197 .H38613 1871 vol.1

Hengstenberg, Ernst Wilhelm, 1802
History of the kingdom of God
under the Old Testament / trans

39967000367941

BT94
.H4 Hengstenberg, E. W.
AUTHOR History of the kingdom of
v.1 God under the Old Testa-
ment.
c.2

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME	ROOM NUMBER
----------	-----------------	----------------

DEC 5

JAN 23

Eden Peterson
Tom Holcombe

BT
94
.H4
v.1
c.2

